

ASOKA EDICTS IN NEW LIGHT

BY

B. M. BARUA, M. A., D. LIT. (LOND)

Professor of Pali ; Lecturer in the Departments of Sanskrit
and Ancient Indian History and culture, Calcutta
University ; formerly Government of India
scholar for Pali.

CALCUTTA

1926

Printed by N. C. Paul, Esqr. at the Calcutta Oriental Press
and published by R. N. Seal, Esqr. at the office of the
Indian Historical Quarterly, 107, Mechuabazar
Street, Calcutta.

PREFACE

The following pages contain a somewhat amplified reprint of the paper—*Inscriptional Excursions in respect of Asoka Edicts*—that appeared in the Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. II. No. 1, 1926. I am much indebted to Dr. N. N. Law, Editor of the Quarterly, for the very keen interest taken by him, but for which the paper as well as its reprint could not have been published so soon. The reprint itself is meant as a souvenir to my friends and colleagues in the University of Calcutta, many of whom cheered me up in reviewing the publication of Asokan studies. Amongst them, Dr. N. Dutt, Dr. S. K. Chatterjee, Dr. K. Nag and Rev. Siddhartha helped me with their valuable suggestions and criticisms. Inspiring were the words with which I was encouraged to give out the results of my study of the inscriptions of Asoka by Mr. P. N. Banerjee, Fellow and Syndic of the Calcutta University, who is a friend of all earnest scholars. Some of the arguments put forward were developed while I read these inscriptions, during the last session, in a combined class of students from the Departments of Pali,

Sanskrit and Ancient Indian History and Culture. We met from week to week to controvert each other's views, as though we were in an eternal school, where every one is a teacher and every one a pupil. I carry the past known to me with me, but I do not wait for it. I proceed with the past or make it follow with me, but I do not think it worth while to stop, whether it follows with me or not. If I reproduce it, I do so not because it will guide my footsteps but because it may help me in avoiding the pitfalls. I owe thanks to my pupil Mr. Charan Das Chatterjee, Lecturer in Ancient Indian History and Epigraphy, Lucknow University, for some of the interesting references from the Pali sources and to my friend Mr. Raghu Nath Seal and my young brother Mr. Sudhir Chandra Barua for helping me in seeing the reprint through the press.

CALCUTTA,
May 12, 1926.

B. M. BARUA

ERRATA

Read *Janasāna* for *Janosāna*, p. S; f. n. 1,

Read *rāñā idaṃ* for *rāñā, idaṃ*, p. 27.

“Asamātaṃ likhitaṃ”

“Dusāṃpaṭipādaye aṃnata agāya palikḥāya”

Asoka Edicts in New Light

The study of inscribed records of Devānaṃpiya Piyadasi Asoka now extends nearly over ninety years. Cunningham's *Inscriptions of Asoka* in vol. I of *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, published in 1879, represents the middle stage in the progress of this fruitful study which commenced since James Prinsep, the father of Indian Epigraphy, deciphered the Brāhmī alphabet, and successfully read and translated the famous Delhi-Toprā Inscription in 1837. The republication of vol. I of the same *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* containing a new edition of the *Inscriptions of Asoka* prepared by Dr. Hultzsch marks, of course, the final stage. This edition stands out as a remarkable scholarly output of the year 1925. This year also has seen the publication of *Asoka Text and Glossary* from the pen of Prof. Woolner and that of the *Carmichael Lectures on Asoka* delivered in 1923 by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar of the Calcutta University. As early as 1919 Dr. Vincent A. Smith lived long enough to see his work on Asoka pass through a third edition. Dr. Bühler's

Progress in
study of Asoka
inscriptions—
how far real?

Edicts of Asoka in the *Epigraphia Indica*,¹ vols. I and II, and M. Senart's *Les Inscriptions de Piyadasi* (1881, 1886) are two great publications that appeared after Cunningham's *Inscriptions*. Words cannot adequately express our indebtedness to Prinsep to whom we really owe the discovery of Asoka as he appears in his edicts. Inspiring is the memory of Turnour, Wilson, Lassen and Burnouf who formed the first group of scholars associated with Prinsep. The work of those gentlemen who discovered Asokan monuments and edicts from time to time is very precious. Supreme is the task of Bühler, Senart, Fleet, Kern and Rhys Davids who endeavoured to place the path of Asokan study on *terra firma* and formed the second group of scholars associated with Cunningham. The third period of the study of Asokan records, characterised occasionally by extravagant and marvellous grammatical niceties and etymological ingenuity, began when Dr. F. W. Thomas created the nuclei in the several instructive notes he had time to jot down in the midst of his busy

1 Fully treated in *Z. D. M. G.*, 1893-94, an off-print from which was published from Leipzig in 1909 with the title 'Beiträge zur Erklärung der Asoka Inschriften.' See also *Archæological Survey of Southern India*, vol. I.

life in the India Office Library. Profs. Oldenberg, Haraprasad Sastri, Sylvain Lévi, Dr. Charpentier, Mr. K. P. Jayaswal and Mr. Harit Krishna Deb represent the group of grammarians and etymologists associated with Dr. Thomas. A new synthetic stage emerged out of these isolated attempts when Dr. V. A. Smith wrote his monograph on Asoka.

It is not too much to say that the world of scholars interested in the study of Asoka awaited the publication of Dr. Hultzsch's edition with much wistful expectation. The prospect held out is not after all very encouraging. As one turns over its pages, reading written records of the Buddhist emperor of India, depending on Dr. Hultzsch's amended texts, interpretation, notes and introduction, the suspicion begins to grow that the position of his readers is no better than that of the caravan merchants in the Buddhist parable in which they are said to have at the end of their journey returned almost to the same spot whence they had started. For example, his rendering of the Bhābrū Edict or Second Bairāt Rock inscription goes to show that he has overlooked the note of the present writer in the *J. R. A. S.*, 1915, used in the third edition of Smith's *Asoka*. As to the identification of the seven Buddhist texts

Hultzsch's readings and interpretations—how far reliable?

recommended by King Piyadasi, his references (*op. cit.*, f. n. 1, p. 174) make it evident that he has not utilised this edition of Smith's book, though it was published six years back. All his foot-notes refer to the second edition of Smith's work published in 1909. As regards the readings of this text, *v[ā]tave* and *diseyā* in line 4 (p. 173) and *bhikkhu-[p]āye* can easily be challenged. From his plate it is clear that the readings would be *vitave*, *diseyo* and *bhikkhupo ye* respectively, the construction of the sentence in which *bhikkhupo ye* occurs being *baluke bhikkhupo ye cā bhikkhun[i] ye c[ā]*", "many, who are monks and who are nuns." His reading of the effaced letters of the third Barābar Hill Cave Inscription as *jalāghosûgama-thāta* (*op. cit.*, p. 182) is hardly convincing.

If the reader turns to the *Carmichael Lectures on Asoka* for light regarding the chronology of the inscriptions, he cannot surely feel that he is in any way more enlightened than he was on reading Smith, Bühler, Senart, Kern and Thomas.

In supporting the earlier translation of *anusamvāna* by 'tour of inspection', Prof. Bhandarkar cites the authority of certain Pāli passages in the Majjhima Nikāya (*op. cit.*, pp. 278-9). These passages illustrate the use of the expression *anusamvānamāna*. But the connection of this with Asokan *anusamv-*

'Anusamvāna'
is not the same
as 'anusamvānamāna'

āna is phonetic rather than semantic. Buddhaghosa has explained *anusaññāyamāna* as meaning "*katā-katam jānanto, anuvicaramāno vā*," (knowing what is done and not done, or judging the actions).

The paramount interest of his lectures lies in his bold attempt to construct a history of Asoka

Brahmanical and non-Brah- manical Ājīvikas	as a man, a ruler and a teacher of <i>dhamma</i> solely relying on the autho- rity of the Buddhist emperor's epi- graphs, each of which is considered
---	--

to be his autobiographical sketch. The discovery of the birth-star of Asoka is highly interesting.

I fail however to understand how the evidence of the inscriptions of Asoka justifies his suggestion that the costly cave-dwellings at Barābar were probably excavated by the Buddhist emperor for the Brahmanical Ājīvikas as distinguished from their non-Brahmanical namesakes who were associated with the Nirgranthas or Jainas. The recipients of Asoka's cave-gifts at Barābar were obviously the same Ājīvikas who received some cave-dwellings subsequently from the Mauryan king Dasaratha. In the inscriptions of Dasaratha, the Ājīvikas are mentioned with the honorific prefix *Bhadanta* (Most Gentle), which is a clear indication of the fact that they were, strictly speaking, *Śramaṇas* or anti-Brahmin recluses, leaving aside the question whether they were Brahmins by caste or not.

Prof. Bhandarkar's assumption of the existence of two divisions of Ājivikas, viz., the Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical, the eaters and non-eaters of fish, rests evidently (*op. cit.*, pp. 170-2) upon his interpretation of certain statements in the Pillar Edict VII, which are as follows :—

“Dhammamahāmātā pi me te bahuvidhesu athesu ānugahikesu viyāpaṭāse pavajitānaṃ ceva gihithānaṃ ca sava [pāsaṃ]ḍesu pi ca viyāpaṭāse saṃghaṭasi pi me kaṭe ime viyāpaṭāse hohaṃti ti hemeva bābhanesu ājivikesu pi me kaṭe ime viyāpaṭā hohaṃti ti nigamaṃthesu pi me kaṭe ime viyāpaṭā hohaṃti nānāpāsaṃḍesu pi me kaṭe ime viyāpaṭā hohaṃti ti paṭivisiṭhaṃ paṭivisiṭhaṃ tesu tesu [te te mahā-] mātā dhammamahāmātā cu me etesu ceva viyāpaṭā savesu ca aṇnesu pāsaṃḍesu.”

Smith renders the text thus :

“My Censors (or High Officers) of the Law of Piety, too, are employed on manifold objects of the royal favour affecting both ascetics and householders, and are likewise employed among all denominations. On the business of the Church, too, they are employed, as well as among the Brahmans and Jains are they employed. Similarly, they are employed among the Jains, among miscellaneous sects, too, are they employed. The High

Officers of various kinds shall severally superintend their respective charges, whereas the High Officers of the Law of Piety (Censors) are employed both on such things and also among other denominations."

Dr. Hultzsch's rendering substitutes "the Brāhmaṇas (and) Ājīvikas" for "the Brahmans and Jains," and "the Saṃgha" (lit. Buddhist Clergy) for "the Church."

Prof. Bhandarkar makes rather a free translation of the text in question :

"Likewise I have arranged that they shall be occupied with the Brahmanic Ājīvikas, the Nirgranthas and the various sects."

Here the point to be decided is whether by the expression *bābhanesu ājīvikesu* Aśoka meant the Brahmins and Ājīvikas or simply the Brahmanical Ājīvikas. The same question arises with regard to the analysis of the compound *bābhana-samanesu* occurring in the Pillar Edict VII, since *bābhanesu ājīvikesu* is grammatically the same expression as *bābhana-ājīvikesu*.

The term *śramaṇa-brāhmaṇa* or *brāhmaṇ* *śramaṇa*, as employed in Indian literature, is a convenient expression to denote all *religieux*, broadly distinguished as Brahmin and anti-Brahmin. The Brahmin *religieux* are supposed to be all Brahmins by birth. The *śramaṇas* are sup-

posed to be all anti-Brahmin in attitude but not necessarily all non-Brahmins by birth.¹ What one has in the above quoted statements is but a clumsy enumeration of these *śramaṇa-brāhmaṇa* or *brāhmaṇa-śramaṇa* religieux, of whom the Brahmin religieux represented four *āśramas*: the *brahmacarya*, the *gārhaṣṭhya*, the *vānaprastha* and the *yati*, *bhikṣu* or *parivrājaka*, in short, both *pavajita* and *gihitha* of the Pillar Edict VII. In this enumeration the Ājīvika is clearly distinguished from the Nirgrantha or Jaina and the Saṃghastha or Buddhist. Now the question is—Is the Ājīvika distinguished from the Jaina and Buddhist as a *brāhmaṇa* or as a *śramaṇa*, as a Brahmanic recluse or as an anti-Brahmanic one? I would say, as a *śramaṇa* or anti-Brahmanic recluse. For, in the first instance, two stanzas of the Dhammika-Sutta (Sutta-Nipāta, verses 381-2) contain a similar enumeration of religious teachers

1 For instance, Bindusāra's court-astrologer Piṅgalavatsa, whose prediction is said to have helped Asoka in life, is called 'ājīva-parivrājaka' in the *Divyāvadāna* (pp. 370-1); the same person, named Janosāna the Ājīvika, is represented as a Brahmin by birth (*Mahāvamsa-Tīkā*, Ceylon ed., pp. 126-8).

other than Buddhist. And in the Sutta-Nipāta commentary one reads :—

“Idāni ito bahiddhā lokasammatehi sama-
nabrāhmaṇehi ukkaṭṭhabhāvena Bhagavantam
pasaṃsanto ‘ye kec’ ime’ ti gāthādvayam āha.
Tattha ‘titthiyā’ ti Nanda-Vaccha-Saṃkiccehi
ādi-puggalehi tihi titthakarehi kate diṭṭhititthe
jātā, tesam sāsane pabbajitā Pūraṇakassapādayo
cha satthāro. Tattha Nāthaputto Nigaṇṭho,
avasesā Ājivikā, te sabbe dassento āha : ‘ye
kec’ ime titthiyā vādasilā’ ti.....‘Brāhmaṇā
vādasilā vuddhā’ ti ettāvatā Caṃki-Tārukkha-
Pokkharasāti-Jānussoni-ādayo dasseti ; ‘api brā
hmaṇā santi kec’ ti iminā majjhimā pi daharā
pi kevalam brāhmaṇā santi atthi upalabbhanti.
‘Keci’ ti evaṃ Assalāyana-Vāsiṭṭha-Ambaṭṭha-
Uttara-māṇavakādayo dasseti.....‘ye vā pi c’
aññe pi ye mayam vādino ti evaṃ maññamānā
caranti.”¹

Here is an enumeration of *śramaṇas* and *brāhmaṇas*, representing the religieux other than Buddhist (*ito bahiddhā*, lit. those outside the pale of Buddhist Order). The list, exactly as the one in the Pillar Edict VII, is not intended to be exhaustive. Five *śramaṇa* teachers: Pūraṇa Kassapa, Makkhali Gosāla, Pakudha Kaccāyana, Ajita

1 *Paramatthajōtikā*, II, pp. 372-3.

Kesakambalī and Sañjaya Belatṭhiputta are broadly distinguished as Ājīvika from the sixth śramaṇa teacher Nāthaputta the Nigaṇṭha. The *brāhmaṇa* teachers are distinguished as aged, middle-aged and young. Caṃki, Tārukkha, Pokkharasāti, Jānussoni and the rest are mentioned as typical representatives of aged *brāhmaṇa* teachers, and Assalāyana, Vāsiṭṭha, Ambatṭha, Uttara and the rest as those of younger *brāhmaṇas*.

Secondly, the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* distinctly mentions the Śākyaas (Buddhists) and Ājīvikas as representatives of *vṛṣaloppravrajitas*,¹ the term *vṛṣalappravrajita* implying not that they were all *Śūdras* or *Vṛṣalas* by birth but they freely admitted them into their orders and were associated with recruits even from among the *Vṛṣalas*.²

In all the Jaina canonical texts, as well as in almost all the Buddhist canonical passages, the Ājīvikas or Ājīvakas figure as followers of Gosāla. In an exceptional Buddhist passage having correspondence with statements in the Pillar Edict

1 *Arthaśāstra*, edited by Shama Sastri, p. 199: *Śākyaūjīvakādān vṛṣalappravrajitān*.

2 *Paramatthajotikā*, II, p. 175: *samaṇakā ti... vasale vā pabbājetvā tehi saddhiṃ ekatosambhoga-paribhoga-karaṇena patito ayaṃ vasalato pi pāpataro ti jigucchanto vasalakā ti āha*.

VII, the *śramaṇa* teachers other than the Nirgrantha or Jaina and Śākyaputrīya or Buddhist are broadly classed as Ājīvika. In order to establish that the recipients of cave-dwellings at Barābar were non-Brahmanical Ājīvikas, Prof. Bhandarkar would have done well to prove that these religieux were dissociated from Gosāla or from Gosāla and other *śramaṇa* teachers excluding Nāthaputta or Mahāvīra. If it be asked why the Ājīvikas, mentioned in the inscriptions of Dasaratha with the honorific prefix *Bhadanta* befitting *śramaṇas*, were mentioned in the inscriptions of Asoka without it, the straight answer would be that Dasaratha was their devotee, while Asoka was not so. Because Asoka was a devotee of Buddhist monks, in addressing them he has used the honorific term *Bhante* or 'Venerable Sirs' (Bhābrū Edict). In all the votive inscriptions on the railing of the Buddhist *stūpa* at Barhut, the Buddhist monk donors are invariably mentioned with the prefix *Bhadamta*, *Aya* or *Bhadamta Aya*.¹

Dr. V. A. Smith had the unsurpassed genius of a compiler. It must be always said to his credit that his rendering of the edicts preserves the 'turn' or 'spirit' of the original. The render-

¹ *Barhut Inscriptions*, edited by Barua and Sinha (Calcutta University publication).

ing which does not bring out in relief the simple but dignified diction of homely conversations, enlivened by a genial personal touch, and spontaneous expressions of an affectionate fatherly heart, cannot fulfil the responsible task of the translator of Piyadasi's epigraphs. But in spite of a good sense that prevails throughout adding to its charm, his account of Asoka cannot claim to be faultless; it is rather faulty, at least in respect of the chronology of the edicts as settled or accepted by him.

Here my immediate purpose is to show how the vehicle of Asokan study has gone off the track and how this can be put back on it. This, I believe, can be best achieved by ascertaining the chronology of the edicts and the exact significance and historical bearings of certain technical terms and expressions in the edicts.

Hitherto altogether 137 inscriptions representing 32 edicts of Asoka have been discovered and

deciphered. These can be conveniently divided, according to the materials whereupon and the manner in which they are found inscribed,

into these six classes: (1) Hill Cave, (2) Rock, (3) Separate Rock, (4) Minor Rock, (5) Pillar, and (6) Minor Pillar. Conformably to this

Chronology of
the Edicts
faulty in
Smith's work

Number and
Classification of
available edicts

classification, their total can be worked up as follows :—

1. Hill Cave : Barābar Hill Cave Edicts, I—III
—3
2. Rock : (a) 10 Rock Edicts, I-VII, IX, X and XIV, each in six recensions : Girnār, Kālsī, Shāhbāzgarhī, Mānsehrā, Dhauri and Jaugada
 $10 \times 6 = 60$
(b) 1 Rock Edict, VIII, in seven recensions : Girnār, Bombay-Sopārā, Kālsī, Shāhbāzgarhī, Mānsehrā, Dhauri and Jaugada : $1 \times 7 = 7$
(c) 3 Rock Edicts, XI-XIII, each in four recensions : Girnār, Kālsī, Shāhbāzgarhī and Mānsehrā
 $3 \times 4 = 12$
3. Separate Rock : 2 Edicts separately inscribed on Dhauri and Jaugada Rocks, each in two recensions
 $2 \times 2 = 4$
4. Minor Rock : (a) 1 Edict, Minor Edict I in seven recensions, inscribed on Rūpnāth, Sahasrām, Bairāt, Maski, Brahmagiri, Siddāpura and Jaṭiṅga-Rāmeśvara Rocks $1 \times 7 = 7$
[(b) 1 Edict, Minor Rock Edict II in three recensions, forming the concluding portion of the last three edicts in the preceding list, not to be separately counted]
(c) 1 Edict, the so-called Bhābrā or Bhābrū Edict, inscribed on the second Bairāt Rock —1
5. Pillar (a) 6 Edicts, I-VI, each in six rec-

ensions, inscribed on Delhi-Toprā, Delhi-Mīrāṭh, Lauriyā-Ararāj, Lauriyā-Nandangarh, Rāmpurvā and Kauśāmbī (Allahabad-Kosam)

Pillars

$6 \times 6 = 36$

(b) 1 Edict, VII, in one recension, inscribed on Delhi-Toprā Pillar.

$1 \times 1 = 1$

6. Minor Pillar : (a) 1 Schism Edict in three recensions, inscribed on Sārnāth, Kauśāmbī (Allahabad-Kosam) and Sāṃci Pillars : $1 \times 3 = 3$

(b) 1 Votive Edict inscribed on Lumbinī or Rummindeī Pillar

— 1

(c) 1 Votive Edict inscribed on Nigāva or Nigāli-Sāgar Pillar

— 1

(d) 1 Votive Edict, the so-called Queen's Edict, inscribed on Kauśāmbī (Allahabad-Kosam) Pillar

— 1

Total 32

Total 137¹

1. The second total would be 139 including the missing records on two inscribed Pillars, one at Benares, the so-called Lāṭ Bhairo, smashed during a riot in 1809 and identified by Dr. Vincent A. Smith with a pillar described by Hwen Thsang, and one at Pāṭaliputra, numerous fragments of which were found by the late Babu Purna Chandra Mukherji.—Vincent A. Smith's *Asoka*, 3rd edition, p. 28 f.n. 1.

the twenty-seventh regnal year, when the Pillar Edict VII was composed. The dated series of inscriptions as discovered up to the present terminates in the twenty-eighth regnal year with the Pillar Edict VII. The Minor Pillar Edicts of Sārnāth, Allahabad-Kosam and Sāmcel, appearing as supplements to the main series of Pillar Edicts, must be later in date, as late as the 29th to 38th regnal year.¹

Dr. Hultzsch agrees with M. Senart and Dr. Vincent A. Smith in considering the Rūpnāth,

Sahasrām and cognate edicts to be
Hultzsch the earliest of all the Asoka inscriptions, and that for two reasons :

(1) they speak of inscriptions on rocks and pillars as a task which it was intended to carry out, and not as an accomplished fact ; (2) they contain the first elements of Asoka's *dhamma*, which are more fully developed in his Rock and Pillar edicts. The Second Bairāt Rock Inscription or the so-called Bhābrū Edict, which may be interpreted as a 'letter to the Saṃgha', seems to be earlier than all the other Rock and Pillar edicts inasmuch as the references to a few Buddhist tracts in this inscription suggest that after his visit to the Saṃgha and before starting on tour, he was engaged in

¹ Smith's *Asoka*, 3rd ed., pp. 27-54, 145-6.

studying the sacred literature, a fact that goes to place the inscription in the twelfth year of his reign. All the earliest proclamations have *śal* (*parābrahma*, *prabrahma*) for their subject. The Rock Edict XIV, in which the author of the preceding edicts states that he caused them to be written 'either in an abridged (form), or of middle (size), or at full length, for the whole was not suitable everywhere', presupposes the Minor Rock Edicts. The words 'at full length' apply to the complete sets of fourteen edicts at Girnar, Kāli, Shahbāzgarhi and Mancharā, which are practically identical, with the exception of the end of edict IX. The words 'in an abridged (form)' may refer to the Rūpnāth and cognate edicts, and the words 'of middle (size)' to Dhāuli and Jaugadā, where two separate edicts were substituted for the Rock Edicts XI-XIII. It can be shown that the two Separate Rock Edicts at Dhāuli and Jaugadā were contemporaneous with the Rock Edict XIII which was issued positively twelve years after Asoka's coronation. In this edict the king says that he ordered the officers of all districts of his empire to undertake quinquennial tours for inspection and propaganda purposes. The First Separate Edict at Dhāuli must have been drafted in the same year because in some of its sections the king speaks of the quinquennial circuit

of the *Āṭakāriyātrās* as a measure which he was about to introduce, and also states that at the same time triennial tours were instituted in the provinces of Ujjayinī and Takṣaśilā. The first six Pillar Edicts I-VI were issued twenty-six years after Asoka's coronation, while the Pillar Edict VII at Delhi-Toprā was published one year later. The Kausāmbī Śāṃci and Sārnāth Edicts cannot be earlier than the first six Pillar Edicts because the first of them, *i. e.*, the Kausāmbī Schism Edict is found engraved on the Allahabad-Kosam Pillar in a position which shows that it was a subsequent addition.¹

Dr. Vincent A. Smith upholds the opinion of M. Senart when he argues in favour of placing the publication of Fourteen Rock Edicts in the fourteenth regnal year of Asoka, that is to say, thirteen years after his consecration. He says that though the Rock Edicts III and IV are expressly dated in the thirteenth regnal year and the Rock Edict V mentions the fourteenth year, in the localities where all the fourteen edicts occur, it is clear that the whole set was engraved at once, their publication taking place in B. C. 256, assuming

¹ *Inscriptions of Asoka*, Introduction, pp. xlv-liv.

that the date of consecration was B. C. 269 and that of accession B. C. 273. It was clearly perceived by the early band of scholars that the Rock Edicts II and XIII referring to or mentioning by name the five contemporary Greek kings were issued when these kings were reigning. These Greek kings are :—

Antiyoka, Antiyoga = Antiochus I Soter of Syria, 280-261 B.C. or = Antiochus II Theos of Syria and Western Asia, son of Antiochus I, 261-246 B.C.

Turamāya, Tulamaya = Ptolemy II Philadelphus of Egypt, 285-247 B.C.

Antekina, Antekini = Antigonus Gonatas of Macedonia, 276-246 B.C. ; 277-239 B.C. according to the authority relied upon by Dr. Vincent A. Smith.

Makā, Magā = Magas of Cyrene, half brother of Ptolemy, 300-250 B.C. ; 285-258 B.C. according to Dr. Vincent A. Smith's authority.

Alikasudara, Alikasudala = Alexander of Epirus, 272-255 B.C., or = Alexander of Corinth, 252-244 B.C.

According to the above list of reigns as given in Beloch's *Greek History* (*Griechische Geschichte*) and cited by Dr. Hultsch, B. C. 250 is the last year when these five Greek kings may be supposed to have been all alive,

while the list supplied by Dr. Vincent A. Smith leads one to specify B.C. 258 as the last year.

Against the received opinion that the Fourteen Rock Edicts, at least the Rock Edicts II and XIII, referring to or mentioning

H. K. Deb. by name the five contemporary Greek kings, were engraved in the

thirteenth or fourteenth regnal year of Asoka, that is, much earlier than the Pillar Edict VII, which is expressly dated in the twenty-eighth regnal year (excluding the year of consecration) or in the twentyseventh (including the year of consecration), Mr. Harit Krishna Deb, praised as a 'young Bengali scholar,' raises a contention seeking to establish a negative thesis that the Rock Edicts II and XIII could not have been promulgated prior to Pillar Edict VII. His contention apparently rests on a supposed omission which appears to him to be significant to the extent of forming a strong argument for his thesis. What is this omission? He finds that the Pillar Edict VII, which contains a resumé of the various measures adopted by Asoka up till the date of its promulgation, does not make any mention of philanthropic works and propaganda of *dhamma* carried out in the realms of the five Greek kings and stated in the Rock Edicts II and XIII respectively.

Against the European scholars' unanimous view that out of the Fourteen Rock Edicts, two at least, namely, the Rock Edicts III and IV, which are expressly dated in the thirteenth regnal year (twelve years from the day of consecration), were engraved much earlier than all the Seven Pillar Edicts, Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar raises a doubt amounting to a contention and a thesis. He seems to think that the dates mentioned in the Rock Edicts III and IV are dates of the different events alluded to, and not of the actual engraving, since there are other dates mentioned in other edicts of this series, such as Rock Edicts V, VIII and XIII, which are unquestionably the dates of some prior events in recollection of the Buddhist emperor : (1) horrors of the war of Kalinga that he experienced in his eighth regnal year (including the year of inauguration) ; (2) pilgrimage to *Sambodhi* that he undertook in his tenth regnal year ; (3) appointment of *Dharma-mahāmātras* that he made in his thirteenth regnal year. He feels absolutely sure that the first six Pillar Edicts were inscribed in the twenty-sixth regnal year of Asoka, while the twenty-seventh regnal year is the date of incision of the Pillar Edict VII. He does not only urge Mr. Harit Krishna Deb's negative evidence for questioning the

soundness of the accepted earlier view that the Rock Edicts II and XIII were inscribed much earlier than the whole set of Seven Pillar Edicts but goes a step further when he tends to suppose that the Rock Edicts concerned were issued in the twenty-eighth year, that is, just a year after the publication of the Pillar Edict VII. He is compelled at last to infer that the Rock Edicts II and XIII, in fact, the whole set of Fourteen Rock Edicts came to be engraved after the Seven Pillar Edicts were incised. But how long after? He would say that as soon as the Pillars were engraved, Asoka took up the work of incising the Minor Rock Edicts, which, in its turn, was followed by that of the Fourteen Rock Edicts. He maintains that at the time when the Pillars were engraved the idea of inscribing the *dhammalipis* on *parvatas* or *rocks* did not occur to the mind of Asoka. In the Sahasrām and Rūpnāth epigraphs (taking them to be typical of the Minor Rock Edicts) Asoka orders that edicts should be inscribed wherever a *stone-pillar* or a *parvata* is found, which shows that the idea of inscribing on *rocks* or *pillars* was new to him at that time, as otherwise there would be no propriety in his issuing that order. Assuming the greater probability of the supposition that Asoka's twenty-eighth regnal year corresponds to 251 B.C., it can be

suggested that he probably ascended the throne in 279 B.C. The Carmichael Professor, with his usual frankness, confesses that the factors examined by him are more or less uncertain, and cannot therefore enable him to fix the date of Asoka's accession to the throne with any accuracy. He is however at one with previous scholars in holding that the Separate Rock Edicts at Dhauli and Jaugada were engraved along with the Rock Edicts and as a substitute for the Rock Edict XIII.¹

Here several questions arise. Is it that the Minor Rock Edicts, as premised by Dr. Hultzsch, Dr. V.A. Smith and Dr. F. W. Thomas, are the earliest of Asoka's epigraphs, or is it that these, as presumed by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, are posterior to the whole set of the Seven Pillar Edicts and prior to all the Fourteen Rock? Is it that the two Separate or Detached Rock Edicts at Dhauli and Jaugada, as assumed by all these scholars, were engraved along with and as a substitute for the Rock Edict XIII of the other versions? Is it that the philanthropic works recorded in the Rock Edict II and the propaganda of *dhamma* recorded in the Rock Edict XIII, as made out by Mr. Harit Krishna

The views criticised.

¹ *Asoka*, pp. 45-48, 265-269.

Deb, are not at all referred to in the Pillar Edict VII which is expressly dated in the twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth regnal year of Asoka? Is it that the dates mentioned in the Rock Edicts III and IV, as pleaded by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, are not dates of their actual engraving? Is it at all reasonable to doubt that the whole set of the Fourteen Rock Edicts was promulgated in the thirteenth and fourteenth regnal years of Asoka (leaving out of account the year of coronation)? Lastly, is it true that the so-called Queen's Edict, that is, the Minor Pillar Edict recording a gift from Asoka's second queen, as supposed by Dr. F. W. Thomas, Dr. V. A. Smith and Dr. Hultzsch, could not have been inscribed earlier than the first six Pillar Edicts appearing on the same Kauśāmbī or Allahabad-Kosam Pillar and must have been inscribed during the closing period of Asoka's reign?

To be frank, I do not quite follow what Dr. Hultzsch, in agreement with Dr. V. A. Smith and Dr. F. W. Thomas, means by saying that the

Minor Rock Edicts must be considered the earliest of Asoka's inscriptions because they speak of inscriptions on Rocks and Pillars

Chronological
position of
Minor Rock
Edicts.

as a task which is not as yet a *fait accompli*. The point which is apparently in his favour is that

in these edicts the expression '*īya ca aṭhe*' (Rūpnāth) has been used instead of '*īyaṃ ca līpi*' 'and this inscription', or '*etāye ca aṭhāye īyaṃ līpi*' 'and for this purpose this inscription', occurring in the Separate Rock Edicts at Dhauli and Jaugada ; instead of '*īyaṃ dhammalīpi*' or '*īyaṃ dhammalibī*' occurring in the Pillar Edicts ; instead of '*āyī dharmadīpi*' occurring in the Shāh-bāzgarhī text of the Rock Edict XIV. In the Minor Rock Edict I one reads :—

(a) Edict proper : "Etiya aṭhāya ca sāvane kaṭe" (Rūpnāth).

(b) Direction : "Iya ca aṭhe pavatisu lekhāpetavāla-ta hadha ca athi s[i]lāṭhabhe¹ silāṭhambhasi lākhāpetavaya-ta" (Rūpnāth).

"Imaṃ ca aṭhaṃ pavatesu likhāpayātha ya[ta] va athi hetā silāṭhambhā tata pi likhāpayathā ti" (Sahasrām).

"And cause this purpose (matter or message) to be engraved on rocks, or wherever

1 Bühler's reading *silāṭhubhe* yields a sensible meaning, namely, 'a stone-mound,' *ḷhubha* being = Ardhamāgadhī, *thubha* or *thūba*. But the Sahasrām text corroborates the correctness of Hultzsch's reading and rendering '*silāṭhabhe*,' 'a stone-pillar.'

there are any stone-pillars there also cause it to be engraved" (Sahasrām).

I am unable to see how these materially differ, except for the blessed term *dhammalipi*, from the statement and direction in the Pillar Edict VII, where one reads :—

(a) Statement : "Se etāye athāye iyaṃ kaṭe."

"Satavisativasābhisitena me iyaṃ dhammalibi
likhāpāpitā ti".

"For this purpose this has been done."

"This edict of dhamma has been caused to be inscribed by me when I was consecrated twenty-seven years."

(b) Direction : "Iyaṃ dhammalibi ata athi silā-
thaṃbhāni vā silāphalakāni vā tata kaṭaviyā."

"This edict of dhamma, if here are stone-pillars or stone-tablets, is to be made (inscribed) there."

It is not true to say that the Minor Rock Edicts were not expressly intended to be engraved as inscriptions, signified by the word *lipi* or *dhammalipi*, because the concluding section of some of them differentiated as Minor Rock Edict II, ends with the statement "*likhita lipikareṇa*" (Brahmagiri).

I cannot but admit that in the great majority of the Fourteen Rock Edicts Asoka distinctly says that he caused this or that *dhammalipi* to be

engraved. Because he has expressed himself somewhat differently, *e.g.*, stating '*mayā idaṃ āñāpitaṃ*,' 'this has been ordered by me' (Rock Edict III, Girnar Text), or '*rāñā, idaṃ lekḥāpitaṃ*,' 'by the king this has been caused to be engraved,' (R. E. IV, Girnar), are we to suppose that these two edicts, in which the word *lipi* or *dhammalipi* does not occur, were the earliest of Asoka's inscriptions?

As regards the Minor Rock Edicts, I find that they were not intended to be inscribed precisely in their present form. Asoka did not send the final draft but only a private instruction to his agents, *e.g.*, son and *Mahāmātras* in charge of his government at Suvarṇagiri, suggesting to whom and by whose command it should be forwarded, what facts should be emphasized, what message should be conveyed, what purpose should be kept in view, how the draft should be prepared, whereupon the drafted text should be inscribed, etc. If the king had sent the final draft, as in the case of the Pillar Edict VII, there was no reason for him to say "and by this text" (*etiṇā ca vāyajanenā*). If the whole of it, as it was sent, were meant to be inscribed in the Sahasrām, Rūpnāth, Bairāt and Maski copies, his agents would not have omitted the preamble like the one in the Siddāpur and two other Mysore texts, as well as the concluding

words of the Minor Rock Edict II. The preamble is :

“ [S]uvaṃṇagiriṭe ayaputasa mahāmātā-
ṇaṃ ca vacan[e]na I[si]lasi mahāmātā ārogiyaṃ
vataviyā hevaṃ ca vataviyā. ”

The above remark is in some way applicable to the Separate Rock Edicts at Dhauli and Jaugada, in which one comes across the expression ‘*iyam lipi*’ instead of ‘*iyam dhammalipi*’, and reads in the introductory statement :

“ [Dev]ānaṃpiya[sa] [va]canena Tosaliyaṃ
mahāmātā nagalaviyohālak[ā] [hevaṃ] vata-
viya (S. R. E., I, Dhauli).

“ Devānaṃpiyasa vacanena Tosaliyaṃ ku-
māle mahāmātā ca vataviyā (S. R. E., II,
Dhuli).

“ Devānaṃpiye hevaṃ āhā [:] Samāpāyaṃ
mahāmātā nagalaviyohālakā he[va]ṇ vataviyā
(S. R. E., I, Jaugada).

“ Devānaṃpiye hevaṃ āha [:] Samāpā-
yaṃ mahāmātā lajavacanikā vataviyā (S. R. E.,
II, Jaugada).

Here in the Jaugada texts the expression ‘*Devānaṃpiye hevaṃ āha*,’ with ‘*lajavacanikā*’ in addition, has apparently been supplied by the man in charge, doing the work of editing, as a means of causing the instruction to be inscribed *verbatim*.

The remark holds true also of the Pillar Edict VII which really ends with the statement—*‘satavisativasūbhisitena me iyaṃ dhammalibī likhāpāpitā ti,’* and it is the man in charge who incorporated, instead of leaving out, Asoka’s private direction, with the introductory *‘etaṃ Devānampiye āhā’* perhaps supplied by him. The recorded direction is :—

“ Iyaṃ dhammalibī ata athi silāthaṃbhāni vā silāphalakāni vā tata kaṭaviyā ena esa cilāṭhitike siyā ”.

The self-same remark applies with a stronger reason to the Schism Pillar Edict at Sārnāth, in which also simply *‘līpī’* has been employed instead of *‘dhammalīpī’* and the section containing the king’s private directions has been caused to be inscribed along with and inseparably from the edict proper which, as evidenced by its two other copies at Kauśāmbī and Sāṃcī, was meant to be concluded with the words *‘anāvāsasi āvāsasiye.’*

Here the most important point to be noticed is the omission, in all the copies of the Minor Rock Edicts but Rūpnāth and Sahasrām, of the king’s two directions as to the rocks or stone-pillars whereupon the message should be inscribed and as to the text to be prepared.

Thus I fail to derive from the line of argument suggested by Dr. Hultsch any real chronological

data for accepting his view in favour of regarding the Minor Rock Edicts as the earliest of Asoka's inscriptions, or for endorsing Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar's opinion in favour of cataloguing the Minor Rock Edicts as posterior to the Seven Pillar Edicts and prior to the Fourteen Rock.

Dr. Hultzsch's second reason is that the Minor Rock Edicts must have been the earliest because they contain the first elements of Asoka's *dhamma*, which are more fully developed in his Rock and Pillar Edicts. Is it true at all? The copies of the Minor Rock Edict I, as determined by the Rūpnāth text, 'have zeal (*parākrama* or *prakrama*) for their subject.' Asoka returns to the same subject as Dr. Hultzsch puts it, in the Rock Edict VI, 'which dwells on the necessity of exertion (*utthāna*) or zeal (*parākrama*) in conducting public business.' Here one must not lose sight of this grand distinction between the two edicts in spite of the fact that they harp on the same subject 'zeal' or 'exertion.' In the Minor Rock Edict I Asoka states what grand result he achieved, while in the Rock Edict VI he simply states how promptly and at all times he transacted public business. Would it not have been most preposterous on Asoka's part to proclaim in the very early part of his reign, as early as the twelfth year from the day of his coronation, that

no sooner he commenced work with strenuous zeal than he attained the grandest possible success in it, the success in mixing or bringing together the gods and men who were so far unmixed in India, that is, stood apart. Was it such an easy task as he might fulfil by exerting himself for a year or a little longer, the task of bringing together in a joyous situation of active work the heaven and earth, the princes and people, the state officials and public, the gifted teachers and common masses, as the two terms '*gods*' and '*men*' imply? The additional matter of the copies of the Minor Rock Edict, as determined by the Brahmagiri text, inculcates certain precepts of conduct which one might have treated as the first elements of Asoka's *dhamma* repeated, emphasized or elaborated throughout his Rock and Pillar Edicts. But here, too, one must judge well the whole matter before deciding once and for all whether the edict represents the prologue or epilogue, the opening or concluding words, the first inspiration or last lesson of a grand epic in the simplest prose. For here Devānampiya Piyadasi concludes his teaching by saying: "Esā porāṇā pakiti dighāvuse ca esa hevaṃ esa kaṭiviye" (Brahmagiri).

"This is the ancient nature (eternal moral order, good old rule). This conduces to long life. Thus this should be done."

Indeed, the rune of the full text of the Minor Rock Edict, comprising what is generally known as the Minor Rock Edict I and what is known as the Minor Rock Edict II, is apt to remind the reader of what is traditionally cherished as the last word (*pacchima-vacana*) of the Buddha who is represented as saying at the last moment of his life: "Handa dāni bhikkhave āmantayāmi vo, vayadhammā saikhārā, appamādena sampādeṭha"¹ "Now, I charge ye, O Bhikkhus, the creations are subject to decay, diligently perform (your duties)".

Regarding the Second Bairāt Minor Rock Edict, miscalled Bhābrā or Bhābrū Edict, Dr. Hultzsch thinks that the references to a few Buddhist tracts suggest that Asoka, after his visit to the Saṅgha and before starting on tour (in his tenth or eleventh regnal year), was engaged in studying the sacred literature, a fact that goes to place the inscription in his twelfth regnal year. In this edict Asoka seriously recommends a selection of seven tracts, prepared by him out of the whole body of teachings of the Buddha for the constant study and meditation of many who were monks and who were nuns, as well as those who

¹ *Sumaṅgala-Vilāsīnī*, I, p. 16; quoted from Mahāparinibbāna-Suttanta, VI, 10.

at Dhauli and Jaugada. In the Rock Edict XIV Asoka says that at the time when it was engraved several other edicts had already been inscribed, some of which he caused to be written 'in an abridged form,' some 'of middle size,' and some 'at full length.' Dr. Hultzsch is inclined to think that by the words 'in an abridged form' Asoka must have referred to the Rūpnāth and cognate Minor Rock Edicts including the one miscalled the Bhābrū. I do not understand why Asoka must have done so. For among the Fourteen Rock Edicts themselves, apart from the two Separate Rock, there are some that are short, some that are long, and some that are of medium length. Of the preceding Rock Edicts presupposed by No. XIV, six at least, viz. Nos. II, III, VII, VIII, X and XI, may be mentioned as examples of those that are short. In bringing the above suggestion Dr. Hultzsch ought to have considered the fact that six preceding Rock Edicts out of a total of thirteen are found to be much shorter than the extant Rūpnāth text of the Minor Rock which appears without the concluding section of the Brahmagiri copy, and shorter also than the Bhābrū, as will appear from the subjoined table of words contained in the edicts in question :—

Edict		Number of words
R. E. II (Girnar)	...	70
R. E. III	„ ...	56
R. E. VII	„ ...	41
R. E. VIII	„ ...	52
R. E. X	„ ...	68
R. E. XI	„ ...	61
M. R. E. (Rūpnāth)	...	112
Bairāt M.R.E. II (Bhābrū ?)		93

It can, I believe, be easily shown by examining a special line of evidence that the Minor Rock Edicts were really not engraved earlier than the Fourteen Rock considered apart from those separately inscribed at Dhauli and Jaugada.

References to
descendants as
data for date .

Let one compare, for instance, the ways in which Asoka's sons and other descendants and successors find mention in the Rock Edicts on the one hand, and in the Minor Rock Edicts on the other, and judge what results therefrom :—

“Putrā ca potrā ca prapotrā ca Devānaṃpriyasa Priyadasino nāṇo vadhayisaṃti idaṃ dhaṇmacaraṇaṃ āva saṃvaṭakapā” (R. E., IV, Girnar).

“The sons and grandsons and great-grandsons of King Devānaṃpriya Priyadasi will increasingly promote this practice of morality as long as the present world system does not reach its termination.”

“Ta mama putā ca potā ca param ca tena ya me apaçaṃ āva saṇvaṭakapā anuvatisare” (R. E., V, Girnar).

“My sons and grandsons and those that shall be my descendants after them, as long as the present world system continues shall conform thereto.”

“Tathā ca me pajā anuvataṃtu” (R. E., V, Kālsī).

“And likewise my progeny should abide by.”

“Ayaṃ dhammalipi lekhāpitā kiṃti ciraṃ tiṣṭheya iti tathā ca me putrā potā ca prapotrā ca anuvataṃ savalokahitāya ” (R. E., VI, Girnar).

“This *dhammalipi* has been caused to be inscribed in order that it (the stated purpose) may long endure, and that likewise my sons and grandsons and great grandsons may conform thereto for the benefit of the whole world.”

“Etāye cā aṭṭhāye iyaṃ [dham]malipi likhitā kiti putā papotā me a[su] nava [ṃ] vijay[a] na vijayataviya ” (R. E., XIII, Kālsī).

“And for this purpose this *dhammalipi* has been inscribed in order that my sons (and) grandsons that shall be will not rejoice over a new conquest (like the one made by me in Kalinga).”

Are these, I would ask, utterances of a man

who had sons, grandsons, great grandsons, and the infinite line of remoter progeny, or those of an inspired young enthusiast who had at the most a few sons capable of growing up into manhood, or had at least clearly before his eyes the prospect of an unbroken continuity of his line? The cited texts do not certainly go to prove that Asoka had any sons and grandsons at the time when they were engraved. But undoubtedly they set forth what the young enthusiast and reformer would naturally desire, that the heirs of his flesh and throne and glory, if there were any, should behave properly in respect of things cherished by him as great, good and noble. In the preamble of the Minor Rock Edict I, on the other hand, one has :—

“Suvamṇagirīte ayaputasa mahāmātāṇaṃ
ca vacanena Isilasi mahāmātā ārogiyaṃ vata-
viyā hevaṃ ca vataviyā” (Brahmagiri).

“It is from Suvamṇagiri that by command of Lord the King’s son as well as of the Mahāmātras, the Mahāmātras at Isila are to be thus informed (observing the customary rules of civility) by way of an enquiry about their health.”

If in this quoted text Asoka meant by *ayaputa* the prince who was his own son, there can be no doubt that at the time when the Minor

Rock Edicts were promulgated he had a son who was grown up enough to be able to participate in the work of administration. Four points are clear from the wording of the direction given : (1) the command is intended to be issued to the *Mahāmātras* at Isila directly from the Prince Royal and *Mahāmātras* in charge of his government at Suvarṇagiri ; (2) the Prince Royal and *Mahāmātras* at Suvarṇagiri are entrusted almost with an independent charge ; (3) there is doubt as yet if the Prince Royal was of proved ability so far as to be made the absolute head ; (4) the king has still reason for fear that the *Mahāmātras* at Isila might not obey their command as it had not come directly from him, if it was not communicated in cordial spirit. The mood displayed is one of a reigning king who has made up his mind to remain gradually away from the scene of governmental affairs after committing their charges to his sons and high officers (cf. *laṇṭukas* made *atapati* later on, P. E., IV), and anxiously watches how far the new experiment is being successful. It is therefore expressly enjoined that they must observe the proper rules of civility. The king himself carefully observed these rules in addressing himself to the Buddhist *Samgha* (Bhābrū Edict).

Following the same line of argument it might

be shown that the Minor Rock Edicts were all engraved somewhat later, and certainly not earlier,

Are Minor Rock Edicts later or earlier than Separate Rock and are Separate Rock Edicts later or earlier than Rock and Pillar ?

than the two Separate Rock Edicts at Dhauli and Jaugada, as well as that the Separate Rock Edicts themselves were promulgated not only later than the Fourteen Rock but later also than the so-called Queen's Edict and the P. E. VII. Just as

the Minor Rock, so the Separate Rock Edicts, generally distinguished as the Provincials' and the Borderers', bear testimony to the fact that at the time of their engraving, the Royal Princes (*Kumālas*) were discharging governmental duties, being placed in charge of apparently four viceroyalties : one stationed at Suvāṇṇagiri together with the *Mahāmātras* ; (2) one stationed at Tosali together with the *Mahāmātras* ; (3) one stationed at Ujeni together with a body of officials (*vaga*) ; (4) one stationed at Takhasilā together with the officials. It is in the two Separate Rock Edicts that the king declares for the first time that in his fatherly heart he fostered all his subjects like his own progeny (*save munise pajū mama*), as well as that he would desire that all the neighbouring tribes, whom he had the power to crush at any moment he liked, should believe that he had the same solicitation for them as for his

own subjects. This sentiment befits only a man who is a father of many children. In the same Separate Rock Edicts the king frankly expresses his inclination to chastise or admonish the Royal Princes and *Mahāmātras* rather than punish or crush the rebels. Here again the sentiment expressed is precisely like that of a long experienced head of a college who finding the teachers to be in the wrong, feels the need of training them up in the higher method of moral discipline rather than chastising the body of students under them and openly speaks out his mind, half in jest and half in shame, knowing it fully well that they will not misunderstand his feeling. There can be little doubt that these Separate Rock Edicts were inscribed as substitutes at Dhauḷi and Jaugaḍa, in the newly conquered Province of Kalinga, for the Rock Edicts XI-XIII, particularly for the Rock Edict XIII. There is indeed an echo of some of the contents of the Rock Edict XIII. But where is the evidence to prove that the Separate Rock Edicts were engraved along with the Rock Edict XIII of the other versions? From their position on the Dhauḷi and Jaugaḍa rocks it is clear that they were inscribed after the set of Fourteen Rock Edicts had been inscribed. The traces of hidden references to them in the Rock Edict XIV are a mere imagination of Dr. Hultzsch and other

scholars read into the text. "My sons, grand-sons that shall be"—this is the manner in which the king's descendants have been referred to in the Rock Edict XIII. From this reference it is not even certain that Asoka had at the time any son, and what to speak of his son's participation in administrative work. Dr. Hultzsch sees a point of contact between the Provincial's Edict on one side and the Rock Edict III on the other in the mention of the 'quinquennial tours for inspection' introduced in Asoka's twelfth or thirteenth regnal year. But here also is a point of difference which is of chronological importance, namely, that the Provincial's Edict refers to the 'triennial tours' side by side with 'quinquennial.' The 'triennial tours' apparently introduced as an innovation were meant not so much to distinguish between the two systems, one applying to the central or home provinces supposed to be under the direct control of the king and the other to the outlying provinces governed by his viceroys and *Mahāmātras* as between himself and the Royal Princes acting as viceroys. I can emphasize this point of difference as a test of chronology because it is quite clear from Asoka's unequivocal statement that there was a period of his reign when only the system of 'quinquennial tours' was applied uniformly in all his dominions (*sarvata vijite*). The Pillar Edict VII

clearly presupposes the one on the Kauśāmbī Pillar in which by the king's own command the *Mahāmātras* in all places are directed to see that the mango-grove or park or almshouse made on the strength of his second queen's donations was recorded as :

[Dānaṃ] dutiyaye deviye ti Tivalamātu Kāluvākiye” :

[This is a gift] of the Second Queen, namely, of Cāruvākī, the mother of Tivara (the Quick One).”

This Queen's Edict, issued between Asoka's twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh or twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth regnal years, any-how not earlier than other Minor Pillar Edicts, such as those inscribed at Rumminder and 'Nigāli Sāgar in the twentieth or twenty-first year of his reign, goes to show that at the time of its incision the king had at least two queens, the second of whom was Cāruvākī, and that by this particular queen he had a son whose pet name was Tivala (one of quick intelligence). From this edict it is not at all conclusive that Asoka's son Tivala was then so grown up as to be able to act as a viceroy. The manner in which Asoka refers to his sons in the Pillar Edict VII unmistakably shows that up till his twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth regnal year his sons were not sufficiently grown up to be

entrusted with viceroyalties. For here the king says :—

“Dālakānaṃ pi ca me kaṭe aṃṇānaṃ ca devikumālānaṃ ime dānavisagesu viyapaṭā ho-
haṃti ti” (P. E., VII).

“These (*Dharmamahāmātras* and similar high officers) are appointed by me (with this express object) that they shall be employed in the distribution of the gifts of (my) boys and princes born of this or that queen.”

In the parallel text in the Rock Edict V, where the king states the various purposes for which he had appointed the *Dharmamahāmātras* for the first time in history, in his thirteenth or fourteenth regnal year, no separate mention of the boys and princes (*dālakas*, *kumālas*) has been made. There is already a suggestion that perhaps by *aṃṇāna devikumālas* in Pillar Edict VII Asoka meant the sons of his father by the queens other than his mother, that is, not his brothers but half-brothers, collectively referred to as *bhātū* in the Rock Edict V, and as distinguished from his own sons (*dālakas*). But it must be borne in mind that the Rock Edict V just refers to the ‘closed female apartments’ (families in Indian sense) of Asoka’s brothers, and does not necessarily imply that his brothers were all or any one alive at that time. At all events, the contexts

yield us no clue to the connexion of *bhārā* in the Rock Edict V with *devikumālā* in the Pillar Edict VII. On the other hand, in the Pillar Edict VII, as also in the Queen's Edict, by *devi* or *devis* Asoka definitely meant only his own queen or queens. When an Indian king mentions his boys (*dālakas*) contrasting them with *aṃnāna devikumālas* in a context where by *devis* he meant his queens, it is very natural to think that by his 'boys' he meant his sons by the ladies of his harem other than his queens, and by *devikumālas* the princes who were his sons by this or that queen. The other suggestion that can be offered is that by *dālakas* the king meant his little boys¹ and by *aṃnāna devikumālas* his sons by his queens who were a little grown up. In this connexion one has the following information from literary traditions. First, the Pāli legends of Asoka tell us that on his father's death he seized the throne of Magadha after having killed all his ninety-nine half-brothers. As soon as he became king, he made his only brother by the same

1 Cf. Divyāvadāna, p. 370: "tasyāḥ (= of King Vindusāra's Queen Consort) putro jātah... kim kumārasya bhavatu nāma? sā kathayati: asya dārakasya... Asoka iti nāma."

mother, called Prince Tiṣya (Tissakumāra), the vicegerent, but the latter joined the Buddhist Order in the fourth year after his coronation. In the same year his nephew and son-in-law Agnibrahmā was ordained. His son Mahendra, by a Vaiśya lady whom he married at Ujjayinī while he was a Viceroy there, also followed the example of Tiṣya in Asoka's sixth or seventh regnal year. The only posthumous son of the king's elder half-brother became a Buddhist novice at a very early age. The Sanskrit Avadāna legends would seem to be of much greater historical importance in this respect because (1) these also attest that Asoka's own brother Vītaśoka (Pāli name Tissa), who alone among Vindusāra's other sons remained alive after Asoka had become in the fullest sense the King of Magadha, joined the Buddhist Order ; (2) these agree with the Queen's Edict in referring to Asoka's two queens, the first of whom was Tiṣyarakṣitā and the second Padmāvatī, the mother of Kuṇāla, a pet name corresponding to Tivāla of the inscription ; (3) these record that Prince Kuṇāla, whose official name was, Dharmavardhana, was born as soon as the 84,000 topes were erected, an event that took place, according to the Ceylonese Chronicles, in the seventh or eighth year of Asoka's reign, better, seven years after the king's conversion to

Buddhism, which could not have taken place, according to the evidence of the edicts, till after the Kalinga war, finished in Asoka's eighth or ninth regnal year ; (4) these go to show that at the time of incision of the Pillar edict VII in Asoka's twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth regnal year Kuṇāla's age was not more than 13 or 14 years (discussed *passim*) ; (5) these also show that up till the time of incision of the Pillar Edict VII, Kuṇāla was not sent out to Takṣaśilā but some years after that time, the viceroyalty at Taxila entrusted to some prince being for the first time referred to in the Separate Rock Edict I ; (6) lastly, these supply a text which is nothing but an echo of one in the Pillar Edict VII as will appear from the following quotation :—

“Tato rājāsokaḥ pañcavaṛṣike paryavaṣite
sarvabhikṣūn tricīvareṇa ācchādya cattvāri
śatashaṣṭhāni saṃghasya ācchādanam dattvā
prthivīm antaḥpuram amātyagaṇam ātmānam
ca Kuṇālam ca niṣkṛtavān” (Divyāvadāna,
p. 405).

If this line of argument leads to any conclusion of chronological value, it is not only that the Separate and Minor Rock Edicts were inscribed a few years later than the Pillar VII and Queen's Edict, but that the Pillar VII and Queen's Edict themselves were inscribed a few years later than

the Fourteen Rock. It also follows that the Minor Rock Edicts must have been inscribed somewhat later than the Separate Rock because the latter set of edicts shows that up till the date of its publication the king's own command (*lājavacana*) continued to be the seal of royal authority for the edicts when these reached the *Mahāmūtras* at Samāpā, although these high officers evidently stood in the same relation to the Royal Prince and *Mahāmātras* at Tosali as that in which the *Mahāmūtras* at Isila did in relation to the viceregal authority at Suvarṇagiri.

In placing the Separate and Minor Rock Edicts later than Pillar VII one has to meet the objections that arise from the arguments

Objections met. of such scholars as M. Senart, Dr. Thomas and Dr. V. A. Smith : (1) that the words '*bahune janasi āyatū*' in the Pillar Edict II can be traced only in the Separate Rock I, and as such the former presupposes the latter ; (2) that the words '*dhammasāvane kaṭe*' in the Pillar Edict VII recur only in the Minor Rock I and as such the former presupposes the latter ; (3) that the Minor Rock Edicts, precisely like the Fourteen Rock, are found only in the outlying parts of Asoka's empire and as such the former set of inscriptions was intended to supplement the latter during the same period of the Buddhist emperor's

reign. But comparing the Seventh Pillar and First Separate Rock Edicts one can see that the words 'bahune janasi āyatā' in question occur in the Pillar Edict VII in connection with the *Dharmamahāmātras* and similar special high officers, while in the Separate Rock Edict I these have been used in connection with the Royal Prince and *Mahāmātras*, that is to say, the Pillar Edict VII presupposes the Rock Edict V, and not the Separate Rock Edict I. Similarly comparing the Seventh Pillar and First Minor Rock Edicts one can show that the words '*dhammasāvane kate*' in question occur in the former in connection with *dhammavādhi* (= *dhammacaravādhi* in R. E. IV, *āhamavādhi* in R. E. V.) and in the latter in connection with *āhavādhi*, the particular *ātha* (purpose) being identified with the king's wish to make '*palakama*' or '*seal*' itself long enduring. Rather the plural use of '*dhammasāvana*' in the expression *dhammasāvanāni sāvāpitāni*, qualified by *vividhāni*, goes to prove that proclamations or readings of *dhamma* of different kinds were caused to be heard on many an occasion, and therefore there is no reason to suppose that the Pillar Edict VII contains a specific reference to the Minor Rock, or that no *dhammasāvana* was made after the date of incision of the Pillar Edict VII. Rather from the contents it is evident that to Asoka the

expression *dharminalipi lekḥāpana* conveys *ipso facto* the same meaning.

One must consider that the Rock Edicts VI and X, which dwell upon the same subject matter 'palakama,' bring out the king's feeling of diffidence making the reader hear almost a cry of despair through it, while in the first Minor Rock

Optimism in
M. R. E. I—a
test of chrono-
logy.

Edict the king conveys an unqualified message of hope by the example of the greatest possible success attained by him in his own life in the past :

"Dukaraṃ tu idaṃ añasa agena parākramena (R. E. VI, Girnar).

"Dukaraṃ tu kho idaṃ chudakena va janena usaṇena va añatra agena parākamena savaṃ paricajitpā" (R. E., X, Girnar, cf. P. E., I : dusamptaṭipādaye añata agāya..... usāhena.)

"Kāmaṃ tu kho khudakena pi pakama-miṇeṇa vipule svage sakyē ārādheta" (M. R. E. I, Siddāpur).

Asoka is so much carried away by the joy which is the ripest fruit of his knowledge of success that he seems to completely forget that when he started his mission of the *dharmma*, the *pakama* a means to an end for him. The result is that at last for him the means becomes the end, and he blesses it with the fullness of his heart (*cilathitike*

ca palakame hotu). I do not see the reason why the Minor Rock Edicts should be taken to occupy the same place in the south as the set of Fourteen Rock does in the east, west and north-west, nor do I understand how they can do so. Bhagavanlal Indraji has already discovered a fragment of the Rock Edict VIII that clearly points to the existence of another copy of the whole set of Fourteen at Sopārā in the Thānā District. This opinion would perhaps have been sound if all the copies of the Minor Rock Edict I had been found in the south (Hyderabad and Mysore). But, as a matter of fact, one copy (Sahasrām) is found engraved in Shahabad District, Behar, one (Bairāt) in the Jaipur State, Rājputānā, and one (Rūpnāth) in the Jabbalpur District, Central Provinces. Would it not be more prudent, I ask, to anticipate the discovery of yet another copy of the set of Rock Edicts in the south?

Regarding the chronology Prof. Bhandarkar has produced little compared with the expectation.

Written in the
sense of drafted
—how far cor-
rect?

If I have understood him aright, he is quite prepared to take Asoka at his word. Asoka in his Pillar Edict VI, says that when he was consecrated twelve years, he caused the *dhammalipi* to be written (of course, for the first time) for the good and happiness of the world:

“duvāḍasa vasa-abhisitena me dhammalipi likhāpitā.
lokasā hitasukhāye” (P.E. VI).

Prof. Bhandarkar believes that Asoka actually did what he says, and that some of the Rock Edicts, notably Nos. III and IV, are the real examples of the *dhammalipi* caused to be written then, that is, in the twelfth year after his coronation. In the same way some of the Rock Edicts, notably No. V, might be cited as an example of the *dhammalipi* caused to be written in the thirteenth year after Asoka's coronation. Prof. Bhandarkar would draw a distinction between ‘*likhāpita*’ or ‘caused to be written’ in the sense of *drafted* and the same in the sense of permanently *incised* on a hard material like a ‘rock’ or a ‘stone-pillar’ or a ‘stone-tablet’ (*pavata, silūthambha, silūphalaka*). For there are some clear instances where certain events, which had occurred earlier but came to be recorded later, *e. g.*, (1) the conquest of Kalinga that was made in the eighth year after Asoka's coronation was recorded at least four or five years later in the draft of the Rock Edict XIII; (2) the pilgrimage to *Sambodhi* that Asoka undertook in the tenth year after his coronation was recorded in the draft of the Rock Edict VIII made a few years later; (3) the *dhammalipi* that had been caused to be written in the twelfth year after Asoka's coronation came to be mentioned

in the Pillar Edict VI, written in the twenty-sixth year. He maintains that there is no definite evidence as to the Rock Edicts (or, better, Rock Inscriptions as he would call them) being incised in the same year in which they were caused to be written in the sense of *drafted*. As to the Pillar Edicts, he finds no reason to doubt that the first six of them were caused to be written in the sense of *incised* in the twenty-sixth, and the seventh one was engraved in the twenty-seventh year after Asoka's coronation. For, in the first place, the Pillar Edict VII, distinctly stated to have been written when Asoka was consecrated twenty-seven years, contains at its end the king's order to inscribe this inscription on the '*stone-pillars*' (*silāthambhūni*) or '*stone-tablets*' (*silāphalakāni*), wherever there were any, in order to ensure its permanency; and secondly, in this inscription Asoka distinctly says that he had '*pillars of the dhamma*' (*dhammathambhūni*) made but does not refer to any '*rocks*' (*pavatas*). It was not till after the seven Pillar Edicts had been incised and until the day of incision of the Minor Rock Edict I that the idea of inscribing the inscriptions on '*rocks*' (*pavatas*) struck the mind of the king, because in the latter inscription Asoka orders that it should be written in the sense of *inscribed* on the *rocks* and likewise on the '*stone-*

pillar if it was there. To be logical, if this order be suggestive of the fact that the idea of inscription on the '*rocks*' was then new to Asoka, then his order in the Pillar Edict VII must also be suggestive of the fact that the idea of inscription on the '*stone-pillars*' was new to him at the time when the Pillar VII was incised. As Prof. Bhandarkar denies the conclusion, he denies also the premiss. As I have sought to show, the materials for engraving find mention in the body of directions which were not intended to be inscribed and yet have actually been inscribed in such edicts as Sārnāth Schism Pillar, Queen's, Pillar VII and Minor Rock I. As regards the Minor Rock and Schism Pillar Edicts, in which the king's order also refers to the text whereby these should be promulgated (*etiṇā ca vāṇajanenā, hemeva viṇaṇjanena vivāsāpayātha*), one must understand that his agents were desired to prepare the drafts on the suggested lines. These directions, whether actually inscribed or not, are unavailing as data for chronology because these are common presuppositions of all the edicts.

By *dhammathambhas* in his Pillar Edict VII Asoka does not appear to have referred to them as materials for engraving his inscriptions but as monuments of Buddhist art, the '*pillars of religion*' as distinguished from '*the pillars*

of royal victory' (*vijayathambha*).¹ It is evident

Dhammatha-
mbhas in P. E.
VII : their dis-
tinction from
silāthambhas.

from the inscriptions at Rummidei and Nigāli Sāgar that these isolated monolithic pillars with crowning animal figures, religious symbols and reliefs were set up when Asoka came on pilgrimage to Buddhist holy places. These very pillars, as appears from the accounts of Asoka's pilgrimage in the Divyāvadāna, were the *caityas* with which the royal pilgrim marked the sacred spots as a matter of favour to the future visitors. In directing his officers to have the edict inscribed on the 'stone-pillars' that were there, Asoka, if his language has any meaning, did not intend specifying only his dhammathambhas to be used as materials.

I am unable to detect any substantial difference between these two orders : (1) one, as in the Pillar Edict VII, directing that the edict should be inscribed on the 'stone-pillars' (*silāthambhā*) or 'stone tablets' (*silāphalakā*), the pillars being mentioned first according as it was a record on a pillar ; (2) the other, as in the Minor Rock Edict I, directing that the royal message

'Silāphalakā'
in Pillar Edict
VII and 'pavata'
in Minor Rock
I denote sub-
stantially the
same material
for inscription.

1 Cf. dhammarijaya contrasted with vijaya :

should be inscribed on the 'rocks' (*pavatā*) or 'stone-pillars'¹ (*silāṭhaṃbhā*), the rocks being mentioned first according as it was a record on a rock. By a 'stone-tablet' one is to understand a 'boulder' or 'detached block' in a rocky mountain that might be used as a tablet for engraving an inscription. By a '*pavata*' one is not to understand the whole mountain or range of hills but a rocky part of it where 'stone-tablet-like' material was available. How can it be suggested, I wonder, that the idea of inscription on the 'rocks' did not strike the mind of Asoka till after the incision of the Pillar Edict VII, if Prof. Bhandarkar admits, as he has admitted, that the first two Hill Cave Inscriptions at Barābar were inscribed when Piyadasi was consecrated twelve years, the date of incision of the inscriptions being the same as that of dedication of the cave-dwellings? The second inscription records that the second cave belonged to the Khalatika mountain or hill-range (Khalatika-pavatasi). The name "Hill Cave Inscriptions" has been devised

dhammamahāmātā with mahāmātā, etc.

1 Divyāvadāna, pp. 389-97: "Atha rājā...
 ayaṃ me manoratho ye Bhagavatā Buddhena
 pradeśā adhyuṣitās tān arceyaṃ cihnāni ca kuryaṃ
 paścimasyāṃ janatāyāṃ anugrahārthaṃ.

by the epigraphists for the convenience of reference ; it does not imply that the inscriptions in question were inscribed on the 'cave' (*kubhā*). The inscribed votive records are Rock Inscriptions, and nothing else. If this is so, how can it be doubted that the Rock Edicts, Nos. I-IV, expressly recording on the 'rocks' in their two versions at Dhauli and Jaugada (R. E. I) that they were caused to be written when the king was consecrated twelve years, were not inscribed in the twelfth year after his coronation and certainly not later, and also not earlier because, according to the king's own statement in the Pillar Edict VI, the *dhammalipi* was caused to be written for the first time in history when he was consecrated just twelve years ? None can detect in these four edicts any recorded event that happened later than the twelfth year of his reign. I take these four edicts together as I find that they are placed consecutively, one below the other, in the same internal arrangement or context. The opening words of the series contain the statement :—

“ Iyaṃ.....sī pavatasi Devānaṃpiye.
[na].....jina[ā] likhā...” (R.E. I, Dhauli).

“ Iyaṃ dhammalipi Khapiṅgalasi pavatasi
Devānaṃpiyena Piyadasinā lājina likhāpitā ”
(R.E. I, Jaugada).

In the Rock Edict III the king says that he inaugurated the quinquennial tours when he was consecrated twelve years. The concluding words in the Rock Edict IV, being connected with the reference of material in the Dhauli and Jaugada texts of No. I, yield the following clear statement :—

“[.....si pavatasi] duvādasā-vasāni abhisitasā Devānaṃpiyasa Piyadasine lājīnēyaṃ likhite ” (R.E., IV, Dhauli).

“[Khapiṅgalasi pavatasi].....(R.E. IV, Jaugada).

The reference of material in the Rock Edict I continues through the remaining numbers of the series of Fourteen, viz., Nos. V-XIV,

Fourteen Rock Edicts engraved not later than the fourteenth and not earlier than the twelfth year of Asoka.

as determined by the versions other than those at Dhauli, Jaugada and Bombay-Sopārā. When exactly this series was closed is still a problem, though it was certainly started in the twelfth year after Asoka's

coronation. The omission of Nos. XI-XIII at Dhauli and Jaugada, either on a prudential consideration of their unsuitability, particularly that of No. XIII, for the newly conquered province of Kalinga in which Dhauli and Jaugada were situated, or through the oversight of the scribes, and the allusion of some such fact in No. XIV,

naturally leads one to understand that these ten edicts were sent out for engraving in at least three instalments: (1) the first one of six edicts, Nos. V-X; (2) the second one of three edicts, Nos. XI-XIII; (3) the third one of just one edict, No. XIV. The recorded fact, in No. V, of appointment of the *Dharmamahāmātras*, made for the first time when the king was consecrated thirteen years, shows that the second instalment was not inscribed earlier than the thirteenth year after his coronation. The historian finds here no other chronological data than the absence of a definite mention of Asoka's sons, the *dālakas* and *kumūlas*, in No. V, a fact which goes so far as to create a presumption in favour of an early date of its incision. Coming to the second instalment one finds that when No. XIII was engraved, the five contemporary Greek kings were still alive or reigning, the Greek kings who are collectively referred to as 'Antiyoka and his neighbours' in No. II which is shown to have been inscribed in the twelfth year. The latest year till which these five Greek kings may be supposed to have been all alive, that is to say, the latest year in which the Rock Edict XIII may be supposed to have been engraved, is, according to Beloch's Greek History, B.C. 250. The fixing of the regnal year of Asoka to which B.C. 250

corresponds depends chiefly on the date of demise of the Buddha. The Buddhists of Ceylon, Burma and Siam place the Buddha's demise in B.C. 544-43. The so-called Chinese 'Dotted Records' suggest B.C. 487-86 as a date for the same event. But by far the most acceptable suggestion is the one that comes from Dr. Geiger (translation of the *Mahāvamsa*, Introd.) and from my friend Dr. H.C. Raychaudhuri (Political History of India), namely, that the real date is B.C. 484-83. The former has arrived at this conclusion after testing the Pāli traditional succession of the kings of Magadha and Ceylon and that of the contemporary Buddhist *theras* in the light of Prof. Wickramasinghe's investigations showing that B.C. 484-83 was known in Ceylon to be the year of the demise up to a certain late date, and the latter in the light of his hypothesis that the Buddhists of Ceylon confused in later times the year of the Buddha's demise with that of Bimbisāra's accession (544-43—60=484-83). If, then, B.C. 484-83 be the year of the demise, and if it be that Asoka's coronation took place 218 years after it, it follows that B.C. 250 corresponds to the king's eighteenth or seventeenth regnal year, and by no means later. The detection of another Buddhist confusion, viz., that, as regards the date of Asoka's first conversion to Buddhism, between the two

father's representative, was just thirteen or fourteen years old when the Pillar Edict VII was engraved. The same prince must then have been just in his mother's womb when the Rock Edict XIII was engraved with the king's prospective statement: "My sons (and) grandsons that shall be." And he was not perhaps in his mother's womb when the second instalment of the Rock Edicts was incised with the mention of an event dated in the thirteenth year from the king's coronation. The Rock Edict XIV closed the first series of Rock Edicts and marked the consummation of the first period of arduous work on new lines which commenced in the twelfth year and ended in the fourteenth. It is referring to this first series of Rock Edicts, and this alone, that the king says in No. XIV that though, when it was engraved, many *dhammalipis* had been written, many yet remained to be written, and regrets that it was not possible to have his *dhammalipis* inscribed everywhere as his dominions were wide by far. Is it not conclusive from such frank statements as these that the first series of *dhammalipis* on the 'rocks,' intended to fix the outer lines of his dominions, is earlier than the Seven Pillar Edicts that stand in the interior? Mr. Harit Krishna Deb's contention needs no refutation. It is to be treated

rather as an acrobatic feat than a sober scholarly argument. There is no reason why the humanitarian works once stated to have been carried out in the realms of the five Greek kings (R.E. II) and success of propaganda of the *dhamma* once stated to have been attained (R.E. XIII) should be referred to once more in the Pillar Edict VII, the object of which is to give only a resumé of the various methods and measures adopted for propagation of the *dhamma*. It needs no mention that without the Rock Edicts, particularly Nos. II-V, as presuppositions, the greater portion of the resumé in the Pillar Edict VII remains unexplained.

Asoka inaugurated the quinquennial tours for official inspection when he was consecrated twelve years (R.E. III). The Avadāna legends say that he himself followed this system in making public gifts and large money-grants to the Buddhist *Saṅgha*. The internal evidence of his edicts or inscriptions shows that they were issued or engraved at the interval of five years. From the engraving of the first instalment of *dhammalipis* (R.E. I-IV) and dedication of the first two inscribed caves at Barābar to the Ājivikas up to the engraving of the last instalment of *dhammalipis* (R.E. XIV)

Quinquennial system as a test of chronology.

and enlargement of the *stūpa* of Koṇāgamana, one is to calculate three years (12th-14th year after coronation, 230-232 or 231-233 B.E.). After five years from his fourteenth or fifteenth regnal year he dedicated a third inscribed cave-dwelling at Barābar and set up the inscribed pillars at Rumminder and Nigāli Sāgar when he was consecrated twenty years. It is to this period (19th-21st year after coronation, 237-39 or 238-40 B.E.) that the erection of the *dharmastambhas* as monuments of Buddhist religion and art must be assigned, the inscribed ones, such as the copies of the Schism Pillar Edict at Sarnāth, Kauśāmbi and Sāncī recording matters relating to Buddhism. According to Buddhist traditions in Pāli, the Schism Pillar Edict should exactly belong to this period (*i. e.*, shortly after 236 or 237 B.E.). It is not unlikely that the Queen's Edict, presupposed by the Pillar Edict VII and referring obviously to Tivala or Kuṇāla as Asoka's little son by his second queen, also belongs to this period. The next period of engraving commenced in the twenty-sixth and ended in the twenty-seventh year after coronation (244-45 or 245-46 B.E.) during which the seven edicts were permanently incised on some of the *dharmastambhas*, the Pillar Edict VII being inscribed one year later than the first six of the

series, when Tivala-Kuṇāla was about thirteen or fourteen years old. If Asoka still adhered to his quinquennial arrangement, as he says he did (S.R.E., I), the fourth period of engraving commenced in the thirty-second or thirty-third year after coronation (251-52 B.E.) during which the Royal Prince Tivala-Kuṇāla (officially known as Dharmavardhana) sent to Taxila as his father's representative for stopping the frontier troubles was aged eighteen or nineteen years. The two Separate Rock Edicts, hinting at the frontier troubles and referring to the viceroyalties of three Royal Princes at Tosali, Ujeni and Takhasilā, must be relegated to this period, that is, to the thirty-second or the thirty-third year¹. If

1 The assigned date of S. R. E. I can be ascertained from the legends of Asoka in Buddhist literature. It appears from the legends of Asoka in the Divyāvadāna that almost in the same year Tiṣyarakṣitā, a passionate woman who was placed in the position of the queen consort caused the Bo Tree at Bodh Gaya to be destroyed and tempted her step-son Kuṇāla into sin, and at about the same time Kuṇāla was sent to Taxila as a viceroy. According to the Mahāvamsa (chap. xx), Asoka's first queen consort Asandhimitrā died thirty years after his accession, *ie.*, twenty-six

Asoka reigned for thirty-six or thirty-seven years after his coronation and continued his quinquennial arrangement, the last period of engraving must have commenced in the thirty-seventh or thirty-eighth year (255 or 256 B.E.). The Minor Rock Edicts, referring to the viceroyalty of a fourth Royal Prince at Suvarṇagiri and hinting at an independent charge being given, must be taken to belong to this period. The enigmatic expression 'vyūṭhenā 256' in the Minor Rock Edict I shows that this edict belonged to this period, and this alone.

Riddle of "vyūṭhenā 256" solved: Meaning of "vivāsa" "vivutha".

In issuing the Minor Rock Edict I Asoka sent the following three orders as to how it should be disposed of by his agents:

- (1) "Iya ca aṭhe pavatisu lekhāpetavālata
hadha ca athi s[i]lāṭhabhe silāṭhaṃbhasī
l[a]khāpetavaya—ta" (Rūpnāth).

years after his coronation; Tiṣṣarakṣitā (Pāli Tissarakkhā) was placed in the position of the queen consort four years later (in Asoka's thirtieth regnal year), and she caused the great Bodhi Tree to be destroyed three years after that (in Asoka's thirty-second or thirty-third regnal year).

- (2) "Etinā ca vawayanēnā yāvataka tupaka
ahāle savara vivasetavāya ta" (Rūpnāth).
(3) "Vy[u]ṭthenā sāvane kaṭe 256 sata vivāsā-
ta"

Put in plain terms, the first order is :—

- (1) "Get this message inscribed on rocks or
stone-pillars."

In plain words, the second order is :—

- (2) "Set it up by this text everywhere within
your jurisdiction."

The interpretation of the third order depends on the significance of these four : (a) *vyuṭthenā* with its variants *vyūthena* (Brahmagiri), [*v*]-*yuthena* (Jaṭiṅga), *vivuthena* (Sahasrām); (ii) 256 with *vyuṭhenā*'s variant before and nothing after it (Brahmagiri, Siddāpur, Jaṭiṅga); with *vivuthā t[i]* before and nothing after it (Sahasrām); (iii) *sata* without any variant; (iv) *vivāsū-ta* with its variant *vivuthā ti* (Sahasrām). These are the various suggestions offered by the previous scholars from time to time :—

- (i) *vyuṭhenā* = Pāli *vivuthena*, *vyuṭṭhena*, Sk. *vyusītena*, *vyuṣṭenā*, 'from *vi* + \sqrt{vas} , 'to dwell' (Pischel); 'by the departed' (Bühler); 'by the illumined' (Oldenberg); 'by the messenger, missionary' (Senart); 'by the wanderer' (Fleet); 'by Asoka on tour' (Thomas, Hultzsch); 'by *vyuṣṭas*,

a class of officers proclaiming a proclamation' (Bhandarkar); 'by the missionaries' (Smith).

- (ii) 256 denotes 'the number of years that have elapsed from the departure of the Teacher, *i.e.*, the Buddha' (Bühler); 'a date after the Nīrvāṇa of the Buddha' (Fleet till 1910); '256 nights spent abroad by Asoka on tour' (Thomas and Lévi, explaining in the light of the Sahasrām '*duve sapamṇā-lāti satā*', *lāti* taken = *rātri*); '256 nights spent in worship' (Fleet 1911), '256 nights spent in prayer' (Hultzsch); '256 individuals or missionaries' (Bhandarkar, Smith); 'the number of messengers or missionaries' (Senart); 'two hundred individuals increased by fifty-six, *lāti* being a mistake for *sata*-(Bhandarkar, Bühler, interpreting Sahasrām text).

- (iii) *sata* (?) = Pāli *satthā*, 'Teacher,' 'the Buddha' (Bühler); = *sattvāḥ*, 'beings' (Senart, Pischel); 'men' (Bhandarkar); 'souls, officials' (Pischel's posthumous note); = *smṛtaḥ*, 'enunciated, mentioned' (Lévi); = *sānta*, 'the tranquil' (Fleet); = *satra*, 'halting place, stage' (Thomas).

- (iv) *vicāsā-ta* = 'illumination' (Veris); 'wander' (Fleet) 'spent on tour' (Thomas, Hultzsch);

'set out on tour' (Bhandarkar); the variant *vivuthā* = 'have gone forth' (Bhandarkar); 'have gone forth on mission' (senart); 'have passed' (Bühler); 'have appeared in the world illumined' (Oldenberg); 'have departed' (Lēvi); 'dispatch edict' (Fleet).

In view of the apparently wide discrepancy between the texts one must be cautious in establishing an interpretation on the basis of a single word occurring in any particular text. It goes without saying that though differently worded, the texts are intended to convey the same idea. I find that in three of these texts, viz., Brahmagiri, Siddāpur and Jaṭiṅga-Rāmeśvara, the reading is practically the same. These three texts are simply worded '*vyuthena* 256.' The Sahasrām text inserts an explanatory clause '*duve sapamṇā lāti-satā vivuthā ti*' between '*vivuthena*' and '256'. In the Rūpnāth text '*vyuthenā* 256' is followed by '*sata vivāsā-ta*'—evidently a similar explanatory clause. The occurrence of '*sata*' can be explained as a curious instance where the scribe intended to express the number also in words but had not done it carefully. '*Vivāsā*' is likely the same word in another form as '*vyuthā*', '*vjuthā*', '*vyūthā*' or '*vivuthā*'. I cannot agree with Prof. Bhandarkar

and Dr. V. A. Smith in suggesting that 'vyuthā' supplies a gap in the Pillar Edict VII. This edict has nowhere a context with which 'vyuthā' can fit in. There can be little doubt that 'vyuthenā' stands in the same relation to the third order as that in which 'vayajanenā' does to the second, or that *vyutha* is but a Prakrit form of Sk. 'vyuṣṭa'.

The Sanskrit Lexicons explain 'vyuṣṭa' as being a synonym for 'dawn' (*prabhāta*). The word in the sense of 'dawn' is used in the Śiśupālavadha (XII. 4). Dr. Shama Sastri in his instructive paper (Report of the Second Oriental Conference, Calcutta, pp. 35—43.) on Vyuṣṭi draws his readers' attention to several texts in the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas and Śrauta-Sūtras where 'vyuṣṭa', 'vyuṣṭi' and 'vyuṣa' are used as synonyms, and used not merely in the sense of earlier morning but decisively in the sense of a periodical early morning suggestive of a new year's day'. In the Varāha Śrauta-Sūtra, as will appear from the following verse quoted from its Akulapada, khaṇḍa III, *vyuṣṭa* is represented as the well-dawned period or fourth *yāma* of night-time, 'upavyuṣa' as the well-dawning period or third *yāma*, 'nīśi' as the dead dark period or second *yāma*, and *pradoṣa* as the fairly clear period or first *yāma* :

“Prathamō.yāmaḥ pradoṣas syāt, dvitīyo
 niśir ucyate,
 Tṛtīyôpavyuṣo jñeyaḥ, caturtho vyuṣṭa
 ucyate.”

As Dr. Sastri has ably shown by citation of passages from the R̥g-Veda, particularly one from I. 113. 3, where the pathway of the night-and-dawn (*naktoṣāsā*) in the year (*sumcha* explained in a Brāhmaṇa passage as *saṃvatsara*) is said to be the same and yet alternately pursued by them, that in interpreting these passages one is not to think of ordinary ‘nights’ and ‘dawns’ but of the longer nights of the *dakṣiṇāyana* by the former, as well as of the longer days of the *uttarāyana* by the latter, the ‘dawn’ as a symbol of the longer days breaking on the summer solstice. I cannot but agree with Dr. Sastri when he suggests on the evidence of the Jaina Sūryya-Prajñapti and Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra that in ancient India the official year commenced on or was counted from the summer solstice, which was therefore treated as the new year’s day, eagerly awaited by all and solemnized with special rites. These brilliant suggestions from Dr. Sastri enable me at once to translate and interpret the explanatory clauses in Āsoka’s Sahasrām and Rūpnath texts as follows :—

“duve sapamṇā lāti-satā vivuthā ti”

(Sahasrām).

“two hundred and fifty-six nights dawned earlier”, i. e., “two hundred and fifty-six years reckoned from the summer solstice when the night is shorter than the day,” Asokan *vivuthā* being equated with Vedic *[vi]ukthyā*.

“[duve sapamṇa lāti] sata vivāsā-ta”

(Rūpnāth).

“two hundred and fifty-six longer dawns,” which is to say, “two hundred and fifty-six years reckoned from the summer solstice when the day is longer than the night, Asokan *vivāsā* being equated with Vedic *vṛṣṣā*.”

As to ‘*vṛṣṣā*’, Dr. Sastri observes rectifying his previous interpretation in his translation : “In the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya (II. 6) it is used as the name of a particular division as the royal year, the month, the half month, and the day. Again in II. 7 Kauṭilya uses the word in connection with the examination of revenue accounts. He says that the receipts, expenditure and the net revenue shall be verified under certain heads in ‘*vṛṣṣā*’.....new year’s day.....will suit the context admirably well ; for the accounts are ordered to be submitted at the close of the month

of *Aṣāḍha* (II. 7) for examination on the *vyuṣṭa* or new year's day. The enumeration of seasons with *Śrāvaṇa* in the rains is a proof that *Śrāvaṇa* was the first month of the year at the time of Kauṭilya."

I welcome Dr. Sastri's opinion but at the same time feel that the two passages in the *Arthaśāstra* illustrating the use of '*vyuṣṭa*' must be represented somewhat differently. I find that in the first passage (II. 6) one has the clear definition of the two terms '*vyuṣṭa*' and '*kāla*.' The former is defined as 'the regnal year, month, fortnight and day,' which is the same as to say, "the date stated in term of the regnal and official years, the regnal year being counted from the day of coronation of the reigning king, and the official year commencing on the summer solstice.' The latter is defined as 'the seasonal divisions of the official year beginning in the rains.'

‘Rājavarṣaṃ māsaḥ pakṣo divasaśca

vyuṣṭam.”

“Varṣa-hemanta-grīṣmāṇām tṛtīyasaptamā divasonāḥ pakṣāś śeṣāḥ pūrṇāḥ pṛthag-adhimāsaka iti kālaḥ.” *Arthaśāstra*, p. 60.

In the second passage (II. 7) Kauṭilya teaches how the revenue accounts should be verified in respect of receipt, expenditure and net revenue

entered under such headings as '*vyuṣṭa*,' '*dēśa*,' '*kāla*,' and the rest.

In Pandit Ganapati Sastri's edition of the Arthaśāstra and its Commentary (p. 138) one reads:—"Rājavarṣaṃ ā-rājarājyābhiṣekādārabdhah samvatsarah, māsaḥ, pakṣaḥ, divasaśca vyuṣṭam, rājavarṣādicatuṣṭayaṃ vyuṣṭasaṃjñam ityarthah. Etacca amuka-rājavarṣe amukamāse, amukapakṣe, amuka-divase, amuka-puruṣeṇānītam etāvad dhanam, adyāmukapurūṣāyaitāvad dattam iti rītyā nibandhapustakādiṣu lekhyam iti boddhavyam."

The quoted extract makes it clear that '*vyuṣṭa*' is used in the sense of the date of entry stated in term of the regnal year and in that of the month, fortnight and day as in the official year. The regnal year signifies the succession of official years in which each current year in relation to those that are past is specified by an ordinal affixed to it, and the ordinal is to be determined by the number of years counted from the day of coronation of the reigning king. The months, half-months and days really belong to the seasonal divisions of time within an official year counted from the summer solstice.¹ There is nothing to prevent

1 With reference to an Asokan pillar in the town of Ne-le in the suburb of Pāṭaliputra Fa-Hien

specifying the official years in succession in term of a current era lengthened by adding to it the regnal years. Considered in this light, Asoka's third order in Rūpnāth may be interpreted thus:—

“In making the inscribed matter public, please see that it is attended with the date 256 (in term of the current Buddha-era).”

says (Legge, p. 80) that it bore an inscription recording in which year, month and day the town was built. But so far as the written records of Asoka hitherto discovered go he has nowhere mentioned the dates in term of the year, month and day. It is in the Kuṣāṇa records that the dates have been stated for the first time in the term of regnal year, and in that of the month and the day of an official year, cf. “*Devaputrasya Kaṇiṣkasya saṃ 5 he 1 di 1*.” The specification of the date in term of the regnal year and the month, half month and day of an official year, as enjoined in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, is a convention which is met with for the first time in the earliest Sanskrit inscription of Rudradāman (A.D. 150): “*Rudradāmnō varṣe dvīsaptatī-tame (72) Mārgaśīrṣabāhulapratipadāyāṃ*.” The convention once established was adhered to in the later Sanskrit inscriptions.

Thus the discussion of chronology may be closed by stating its results in the subjoined table :—

Table of dates of the edicts.	Years after coro- nation, years after parinirvāṇa.	B. C.
Edict		
Barābar Hill cave I—II } Rock I—IV Rock V—X Rock XI—XIII Rock XIV	12, 230-231 " " " 13, 231-232 14, 232-233 " " "	254-253 " " 253-252 252-251 " "
Barābar Hill cave III Rumminder and } Nigāli Sāgar Schism Pillar at } Sarnāth Kau- śāmbī, Sāṃcī } Queen's (?) Pillar I—VI Pillar VII Separate Rock I—II Minor Rock I—II } Second Bairāt (Bhābrū)	19, 237-238 20, 238-239 21, 239-240 " " " 26, 244-245 27, 245-246 32, 250-251 37, 255-256	247-246 246-245 245-244 " " 240-229 239-238 231-233 229-228

The dissertation will remain incomplete without an excursus on the meaning of some of the disputed Asokan words and expressions. My object in the excursus is to indicate how still some new light can be thrown on the significance of such words and expressions as '*nijhapayisaṃti*' (P. E. IV), '*nijhātī*'

Excursus

(R. E. VI), 'nijhati' (P. E. VII), 'vaca' (R. E. VI), 'vacabhūmikā' (R. E. XII), 'anusamyāna' (R. E. III, S. R. E. I), 'silāvigaḍa' (Rummindeī), 'maga', 'mora', (R. E. I), 'Saṃghe upayāte' (M. R. E. I) :—

I. NIJHAPAYISAMTI (P. E. IV).—Dr. Lüders has rightly explained it as meaning "will make (the authorities) reconsider" on the authority of the Jātaka-verse 334 (IV. p. 495) :

"Aparādhakā dūsakā heṭhakā ca
labhanti te rājino nijhapetum,
na maccuno nijhapanam karonti."

But it must be noted that in the gloss the word has been explained somewhat differently in the two connexions : (1) in the case of Yama, the king of death, as "*balikammavasena khamāpentī pasādentī*", "cause to pardon, please to relent by virtue of sacrificial offerings"; (2) in the case of earthly king as "*sakkhīhi attano niraparādhabhūvaṃ pakāsetvū pasādetvū*", "causes to reconsider his case by proving his own innocence by depositions of witnesses called in his favour, persuades to release (by payment of ransom, etc.)." In both the connexions the word carries the idea of persuasion. Cf. Jātaka (VI. p. 516, verses 1924, 1926) :

"*nijjhāpetum mahārājaṃ*", explained in the gloss as "*niddosabhāvaṃ jānāpetum*", "*niddosabhāvaṃ nijjhāpane*".

2. NIJHATI (R. E. VI).—It occurs as a part of the

idiom : “*tāya athāya vivādo nijhati va saṁto parisāyaṃ*,” “in that matter a division or adjournment takes place in the council” (V.A. Smith); “there is any division or rejection in the council” (Bhandarkar). *Nijhati* = “meditation, reconsideration, adjournment or appeal” (Woolner); “adjournment” (Lüders, Thomas); “amendment” (Hultsch); “casting away, rejection” (Jayaswal, taking *nijhati* = *nikṣapti*). I suggest “mutual understanding, coming to an agreement” (*atthañ ca kārāṇā ca dassetvā aññamaññaṃ jñāpanaṃ, nijjhāpanaṃ*,)¹ and hold that the right passage to be cited is the one from the Majjhima-Nikāya, Kosambika-Sutta or from the Aṅguttara-Nikāya, Part I, Parisā-vagga, p. 66 : “Yassaṃ parisāyaṃ bhikkhū adhikaraṇaṃ ādiyaṇti dhammikaṃ vā¹ adhammikaṃ vā te taṃ adhikaraṇaṃ ādiyitvā na e’eva aññamaññaṃ saññāpentī na ca saññattīṃ upagacchanti na ca nijjhāpentī, na ca nijjhattīṃ upagacchanti, etc”. Here *nijjhatti* is used almost a synonym for *saññatti*; cf. the Jātaka VI. p. 528, verse 2007; “*nijjhattā Sivayo sabbe*,” “all the Śivi people have come to understand or to an understanding,” “*nijjhattā ti saññattā*” in the gloss.

¹ Majjhima-Nikāya-Commentary on the Kosambika-Sutta.

In the Manoratha-Pūraṇi (Aṅguttara-Commentary) the terms *saññatti* and *nijjhatti* are explained thus : "*saññāpentī ti jānāpentī*", "*nijjhāpentīti pek-khāpentī*", "*olokāpentī*," according to which *saññatti* is "making the matter known", and *nijjhatti* "making the matter understood or considered."

3. NIJHATI (P.E. VII).—It is one of the two-fold means whereby Asoka sought to make his mission of the *dhamma* effective, the other being *dhammaniyama*. *Nijhati* is said to be the more essential or valued of the two means. It means "deep meditation" (Bühler and Senart, cf. Sk. *nīdīdhyāsana*); "deep thought, self-control" (Laddu, Sk. *nīdhvapti*, quoting '*nijjhattibala*' 'power of control' from the Paṭisambhidāmagga); "reflexion" (Thomas); "exhortation" (Hultzsch); "wholesale prohibition" (Bhandarkar); "casting away, rejection" (Jayaswal); "deliberation" (Lüders). '*Nijjhatti-bala*' does not mean the 'power of control', cf. Aṅguttara, iv, p. 223 : "*ujjhattibalā bālā, nijjhattibalā paṇḍitā*". '*Ujjhatti*', as explained in the Commentary, implies 'an obstinate adherence to one's own statement, side or opinion (*yaṃ asuko idaṇca idaṇca āha mṃ so āha na aññanti evaṃ ujjhānaṃ*)'; '*nijjhatti*' implies 'a sober consideration of facts' (*atthānattha-nijjhāpanaṃ*), 'making one understand by placing facts and reasons' (*atthaṇca kārapaṇ ca dassetvā nijjhāpanaṃ*). This

last sense stands nearest to Asokan meaning. But I feel that in Asokan context one has to devise an interpretation contrasting '*nijhati*' with '*dhammaniyama*', the latter carrying with it the idea of 'regulation' or 'compulsion.' 'Persuasion' or 'appeal' suits well, Asoka's appeal being not so much to 'reason' as to 'human heart' or 'good sense.' The triple means of persuasion adopted by him consists of personal examples, religious and artistic demonstrations, and statement of essential principles of conduct.

4. VACA, VRACA (R. E. VI).—It means "the latrine," "the closet" (Bühler, *vraca*=*varcagṛha*); "the mews" (V. A. Smith following Jayaswal who rightly equates '*vraca*' with Sk. '*vraja*,' cf. '*vraceya*' in the sense of '*gacheya*' R.E. VI); "the stables" (Bhandarkar); "the cow-pen" (Hultzsch); "the road" (Vidhusekhar Bhattacharyya). I suggest "the recreations primarily by way of musical entertainments." '*Vaca*' or '*vraca*' is mentioned as one of the six occasions when the king was supposed to be attending to his personal comforts and enjoyments and inaccessible to the public, strictly observing privacy. These occasions are: (1) *bhuñjamānasi* (while eating); (2) *orodhanamhi* (while in the midst of the ladies of the harem); (3) *gabhāgāramhi* (while in the bed-chamber and in the company of the queen);

(4) *vacamhi* ? (5) *vinītamhi* (while driving in a procession) ; (6) *uyānesu* (while sporting in the pleasure). These are the 'blessings of city-life' (*nagara-sampatti*) and 'enjoyable things' (*upabhoga-rasa*) whereby, in the Jātaka, V, pp. 505-7, a king, forgetful of his former state of glory, is appealed to. Combining Nos. (5) and (6) into one category, the Jātaka enumerates them as :—(1) *bhojana* (food) = *bhuñjamāna* ; (2) *kilesa* (passions) = *orodha* ; (3) *sayana* (bed) = *gabhāgāra* ; (4) *nacca-gīta-vādita* (song, dance, music) = *vaca-vraca* (?) ; (5-6) *uyāna-nagara* (park and city), *migūcirūpetapura*, *migūcira uyyāna* (royal pleasure reached by such conveyances as horses, elephants and chariots) = *vinīta-uyāna*. Comparing the two lists and noting the points of agreement I cannot but think that '*vaca*' is connected with musical entertainments and similar pastimes.

5. VACABHŪMIKĀ (R. E. XII).—This denotes a body of officials mentioned after '*Ithījhaka-mahāmātā*', 'the *Mahāmātras* as censors of women' (R. E. XII). They represent the "overseers of cow-pens" (Bühler) ; "Inspectors of cow-pens" (V. A. Smith) ; "Officials connected with the cattle-herds" (Bhandarkar). I differ. There is no doubt that '*Vacabhūmikā*' = Sk. '*Vrajabhūmikāḥ*', 'those in charge of *vrajabhūmi*.' The term '*vrajabhūmi*' is explained in the Śabdakalpadrūma as meaning

'*śānti śāntimān*' 'sportful amusements in a collective sense', or, symbolically, 'the *Andarāś* tree where Kṛṣṇa amuses himself with the Gopīs or *Ṭṛyaśīrṣṇīkās*, who are experts in singing, dancing, music and other pleasing arts'. The word '*yūṣṭā*' denoting in Bengali a kind of musical performance, is the same word in meaning as *ṛgāṭ* 'gamane (to go). In some edition of Subal Chandra Mitra's Bengali Dictionary, '*ṛgāṭ*' is said to denote a kind of '*nṛtīyāṭ*' dramatic performance. Asoka's '*śāntimān*' '*Śāntimān*' corresponds no doubt to Kaṭṭhīya's '*Gaṇḍhīyāṭ*', 'Superintendent of courtesans' *śānti* or *śānti* being = *nṛtīyāṭ* or *nṛtīyāṭ*, i.e., the courtesans as dramatic actresses, as female dancers, singers and musicians. The functions of the Superintendent of Courtesans in the *Arthashastra* include also the supervision of the courtesans following the pleasing arts as a profession. *Ṭṛyaśīrṣṇīkās* means *nṛtīyāṭ*. The 'dance, song and music' corresponding to '*śānti*' are but typical examples of '*nṛtīyāṭ*', which, as explained in the *Ball Śāntimān* comprises all the 'pleasing arts' (*śānti*). I therefore suggest that Asoka divided the functions of Superintendent of Courtesans and placed some of them among of these Superintendents and some among of the newly appointed *śāntimān*.

Superintendents of Recreations and Amusements.

6. ANUSAMBYĀNA (R.E. III, S.R.E.I.).—It means 'a tour for official inspection (Bühler); "circuit" (V. A. Smith, Bhandarkar); "complete tour" (Hultzsch); "official transfers" (V. A. Smith in agreement with Jayaswal). The credit of making a right hit on a Pāli passage in the Aṅguttara, I, pp. 59-60 illustrating the use of *anusambyāna* is due to my friend and pupil Mr. Charan Das Chatterjee, Lecturer, Lucknow University, who drew my attention to it. The passage is :—

"Yasmiṃ samaye corā balavanto honti
rājāno tasmīṃ samaye dubbalā honti : tasmīṃ
samaye rañño na phāsu hoti...paccantime
janapade anusaññātum".

"At the time when the thieves are powerful, the kings then become weak : at that time it is not easy for the king to go into the frontier districts for *anusambyāna*."

One can see that the passage itself has used *anusambyāna* in the sense of going for inspection of outdoor works, duties in the outer regions. But this is not enough. The technical meaning of the word, corresponding to the Asokan, is fully brought out in the Commentary where one reads :—

"Paccantime janapade anusaññātun ti—gāmā-
vāsa-karaṇatthāya, setu-atthāya, pokkharani-khaṇā-

The meaning of the second part "*silāthabhe ca usapāpīte*" is obvious ; it is : "and the stone-pillar has been caused to be set up." In the opinion of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar and Dr. Fleet *silāvigada* = Sk. *śilāvikṛta*, and *bhīcā* = *bhittikā*, and the whole expression means, a "stone-wall" or "stone-enclosure." Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar accepts this interpretation. Dr. Hultzsch would take it to mean "a brick wall decorated with stone." Dr. Charpentier separates *cā* ("and") from *silāvigada* and explains the latter as meaning "bearing on its top the stone-figure of an active horse," *vigada* being = *agada*, *agada* being a shortening from *agalitāśva*, *galita* meaning 'unbroken,' 'idle,' 'inactive,' *bhī* being = Sk. *bhṛt* ("bearing").¹ It is apparently Hwen Thsang's description of Asoka's pillar at Lumbinī that has led Dr. Charpentier to make the figure of a horse out of *silāvigada*. Hwen Thsang says that when he visited Lumbinī, the upper part of the pillar set up by Asoka was lying on the ground and it bore the figure of a horse. The Jaina Uttarādhyayana-Sūtra, edited by Dr. Charpentier, has enabled him to gather therefrom the expressions *galiyassa* meaning 'an unbroken, idle horse,' and *gali-gaddaha* meaning 'a

¹ Indian Antiquary, 1914, pp. 17, f. 11.

bad, lazy donkey.' The Rummindei Pillar inscription, commented by him, contains the expression *silā-vigaḍa*. First, a preconception; second, an exploitation; third, an exhibition. Should we pass this curious jugglery as a fine feat of philology because it is European? But some of the scholars even incline to make out the figure of an ass, taking *vigaḍabhī* to be = *vigardabhī*. I fail to understand how the figure of an active horse or that of a lazy donkey could be made out of *silāvigaḍa*, which is apparently = *silāvikatā*, *silāvikata*, *śilāvikṛta*. I find that *vikāra* in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (VI. 1), the Sāṃkhya *vikṛti* as applied by the grammarians and in the treatises on art,¹ and the Pāli *vikatikā* (cf. *gūlavikatikā*, *pāsādavikatikā*,¹ *pīlandhana-vikatikā*, Childers Pāli Dictionary, *sub voce* *vikatikā*) mean the same thing, that is, "something transformed, transfigured". Buddhaghosa explains *vikatikā* as meaning: "*sīhabyagghādirūpa-*

1 The Vishṇudharmottaram (a treatise on Indian painting) translated by Dr. Stella Kramrisch, Calcutta University Publication, pp. 1-2: "The whole universe should be known as the *vikṛti* (i. e., transformation) of him, (when) endowed with form."

vicitto unṇāmayo attharako", "a linen coverlet well adorned with the figures of lions, tigers and the like."¹ This enables me to suggest that here '*silā-vigaḍa*' represents indefinitely the 'crowning stone-figure', cf. the Mahāvamsa description of pillars (xxvii. 30) :

("Sīha-byagghādi-rūpehi devatā-rūpakehi ca
Ahu ratanayehesa thambhehi ca vibhūsito."

"It was decorated with the jeweled pillars surmounted by the figures of lions, tigers and other animals, or by those of deities".

What is *bhī* ? It is just an expletive particle = *hi*. If *silā-vigaḍa* or *silā-rūpaka* was an integral part of the monolith, why has it been separately mentioned ? It is obviously to draw attention, cf. E. Gateway inscription at Barhut : "*kāritam toraṇam silā-kammanṭo ca upamṇa*". Here *silā-kammanṭa* (stone-work, ornamental arch with designs in stone) is a superstructure of the gateway, cf. fragments of inscriptions on two other Barhut Gateways.

8 MORA, MAGA (R.E.I).—The Rock Edict I is concluded with the statement : "Henceforth, since this edict is inscribed, just three living creatures are (daily) killed (in the royal kitchen)

1 Paramatthajotikā, II, p. 575.

for royal dishes : two *mora's* and one *maga*, the latter however not invariably. Even these three creatures will not hereafter be killed." *Mora* specifically denotes peacock and *maga*, deer. In explaining why the peacocks could not be dispensed with Prof. Bhandankar draws attention to a Pāli commentary passage stating that peacock's flesh was a delicacy to the people of the Middle country (*Asoka*, p. 16). In the *Arthaśāstra* (Ch. 43), *mrga* and *mayūra* are mentioned among the beasts and birds in a pleasaunce that are deserving of royal protection. The preclusion of these creatures from Asoka's list of living species made immune from killing by men (P.E.V) is significant. There is no doubt that his favourite dishes consisted of venison and peafowl's flesh, particularly of the latter. But is it not unusual that from day to day two peacocks and one deer were killed, and no other bird and beast as substitutes? Buddha-ghosa's comments on the Bhayabherava-Sutta (*Majjhima-Nikāya*) suggest that both (deer) *maga* and *mora* (peacock) were sometimes used to denote the genera, the former as the type of beasts, the latter of birds : "*Mago vā āgacchati : sabbacatuppadānaṃ hi idha mago (migo) ti nāmaṃ*" ; "*moro vā kaṭṭhaṃ pāteṭīti : moragahaṇena ca idha sabbapakkhigahaṇaṃ adhippetam..... Moro vāti : vā saddena añño vā koci pakkhīti.*"

Cf. Fausböll's *Jātaka*, vol. V. p. 505, describing favourite royal dishes :

"Catuppadaṃ sakuṇaṃ cāpi maṃsaṃ
Sūdehi randhaṃ sukataṃ suniṭṭhitaṃ."

"Of beasts and birds of every kind the flesh
thou once didst share,
By skilful cooks prepared was it, in sooth a
dainty fare." (Francis)

9. SAṂGHE UPAYATE (M. R. E. I).—Buddhist legends of Asoka in Pāli and Sanskrit, as well as Asoka's own records distinctly refer to two stages in Asoka's conversion to Buddhism. According to Pāli legends, the first stage resulted from an accidental meeting of the king with Buddhist novice Nigrodha, whose subdued manners attracted his attention, and whose recital of the Appamāda-vagga was effective so far as to win from him a genuine admiration for the inner spirit of action in Buddhism ; the second stage commenced when this novice brought the members of the Saṅgha, in larger and larger numbers, into the palace and his presence. He received them favourably, and they produced a permanent impression, impelling him to shake off his adherence to the Brahmin wanderers and the rest, and profess his faith in the Triad. The second stage had not been consummated until the fourth year when he began to erect the 84,000 *vihāras* and his younger brother Tissa,

the viceregent, joined the order. He took three years to complete these monastic centres under the direction of Tissa, the leader of the Saṃgha, and on the completion of this project he established a kinship with the Saṃgha by allowing his son, daughter, son-in-law and daughter's son to be ordained. According to Sanskrit legends in the Divyāvadāna, the first stage, implying just a change of heart, came about when the king happened to meet, quite accidentally, a Buddhist monk, Bālapaṇḍita or Samudra, and witnessed his wonderful spiritual powers. The second stage had not commenced until he came into contact with other members of the Saṃgha, and was not consummated until he waited upon Upagupta and made him his spiritual guide. According to Hwen Thsang's information, it is Upagupta who converted him to Buddhism. Thus these legends agree in so far as they contrast two stages in Asoka's conversion as a Buddhist *āśramī*: first when he remained a personal admirer and supporter of an individual monk or novice; second, when he came to identify himself with the cause of the Saṃgha. There is not the slightest hint as to his taking the vows of a monk (*bhikkhu*), or a monk-like recluse (*bhikkhagāthi*), or a recluse-like householder (*gṛhastha*). Do we get any different hint from the edicts? In the

so-called Bhābrū edict Piyadasi addresses the Saṅgha as the 'King of Magadha' (*lājā Māgaḍha*), and asks its representatives to consider how deep and extensive was his faith in and reverence for the Triad. The internal evidence of the remaining edicts goes to show that his household ties were as strong for him as for any other ordinary householders. He has nowhere claimed the headship of the Church. The authority exercised by him in expelling the monks causing schisms within the Saṅgha was not incompatible with his position as Indian king, who was looked upon as the custodian of the interests of existing orders, so long as he had the sanction from the persons whom he might confidently take to be the real representatives. The humanitarian measures and works undertaken by him were those enjoined in Buddhist scriptures as duties of noble-minded citizens and righteous kings. He has nowhere harped upon Arhatship as an ideal or on Nirvāṇa as a goal. Throughout his edicts he has urged all to strive for the experience of heavenly joys, here as well as hereafter. In fact, his teaching stands in the same relation to Buddhism as Jaimini's to Vedānta. In the eighth or ninth year of his reign his heart became eager for the reception of truth ; in the twelfth year he issued his first edict with his lofty message. In the

Minor Rock Edict I, he gives an account of the interim of four years, stating how he came to take up an active mission of *dhamma*. He says that in the first stage when he had remained a Buddhist *upāsaka* for more than two-and-a-half years, he did not exert himself much. When, later on, he became associated with the Saṃgha for a year, or for a longer period, he made a strenuous exertion. What did he mean by saying that he became associated with the Saṃgha? In the opinion of Bühler and Kern, he became for the time being a monk, ceasing to be the monarch, the monastic vows being incompatible with kingly duties. Smith holds that he actually assumed monastic vows without ceasing to be the monarch the monk and monarch being not incompatible, and cites in his support the evidence of I-tsing who saw a statue of Asoka as a monk, and the examples of the Jaina king Kumārapāla and two Buddhist kings, one of Burma and one of Tibet. Prof. Bhandarkar contends that the examples cited are of a far later age, and the evidence cited is less authoritative than that of the earlier Chinese travels and Buddhist legends which seem to know nothing about it. He suggests, recommending the opinion of Mr. Charan Das Chatterjee, that Asoka perhaps became a *Bhikkhugatika* or monk-like recluse in the householder's garb, and actually

resided for sometime with the monks in the monastery. M. Senart would think Asoka's meaning is that he waited upon, was in the midst of, the members of the Saṃgha, as described in Pāli Chronicles. I agree partly with M. Senart, and differ entirely from the rest. If he had become a monk, he might have plainly stated it. There was no need for circumlocution. Further, *Saṃghe upayāte* is not the usual expression to signify the entry into the Saṃgha as a monk or even as a novice. I cannot think he became a *Bhikkhugatika*, residing in the monastery. A *Bhikkhugatika* is in all sense a recluse who cuts off his connection with the world and whose aim is Nirvaṇa. The same holds true of *āgāramuni* (Mahāniddeṣa, p. 58). The contrast is between an *upāsaka* who was the personal admirer of an individual monk, taken as a representative of the Saṃgha and an exponent of the Doctrine, and an *upāsaka* who, on coming into contact with the Fraternity, gained conviction and became identified with its cause. Buddhaghosa's dissertation as to who is a *upāsaka* (Sumaṅgala-Vilāsini, I. pp. 230-6) clearly indicates the process whereby a lay convert can proceed from a subjective mood of admiration to an objective connexion and self-surrender. From this it is clear that *Saṃghe upayāte*, *Saṃghe upayāte*, *Sagha-upete* or *Sam-*

ghaṃ upagate is a shortening from *Samghaṃ saraṇaṃ gato* ; *Samghaṃ saraṇattham upeto* ; *Samghaṃ me ratanaṃ, saraṇaṃ, etaṃ parāyanaṃ ti upeto* ; *Samghassa sissabhāvūpagato* ; cf. *vandati = sirasā vandati*.

POSTSCRIPT.

Mr. Charan Das Chatterjee informs me that the passage in the *Sāratthappakāsinī* (Buddhaghosa's Comy. on the *Samyutta Nikāya*) referred to by Prof. Bhandarkar (*Asoka*, p, 16), supports my interpretation of *mora* in R. E. I. This passage does not only mention the pea-fowl's flesh but refers to the flesh of other birds, if not of other creatures, which was considered a delicacy by the people of the Middle Country. For the expression used is not specifically *moramamsa*, but rather indefinitely *moramamsādāni*.

